

DOI 10.31489/2022Ph4/106-111

УДК 82-31

O. Söylemez\*, Ö. Faruk ATEŞ

*Kastamonu University, Turkey  
(E-mail: soylemezo@kastamonu.edu.tr, omerfarukatas34@gmail.com)*

### The image of mangurt in the story ‘Grey Fierce’ (Kökserek) by M. Auezov

“There have been two Muhtars in my life. One is my close support like my father, my master, the great writer Mukhtar Auezov; the second is the enlightened poet, my confidant for many years, my brother Mukhtar Shahanov.”

Chingiz Aitmatov

The article reveals the theme of mankurtising through the story of Mukhtar Auezov's “Kökserek”. Mankurtization is the loss of self-values of the individual and ontologically falling into the existential void of the individual. This decline is seen in the form of alienation of the individual from himself and the values of the society in which he lives. Mankurtization is a process of extinction in which the individual enters unconsciously. Mankurtization is a process of extinction, into which an individual enters unconsciously. Under the totalitarian system, they tried to erase the ideological space of the Turkic peoples. In Soviet times, the transformation (policy of mankurtization) of a wolf (Turks) into a dog (slave) was carried out. Mukhtar Auezov uses a wolf as a symbol of this event. The study used methods of comparative analysis, discursive analysis, content analysis. As a result, the authors conclude that the image of ‘wolf’ symbolizes freedom, national values and spiritual strength of the Turkic people.

*Keywords:* Mukhtar Auezov, semantic relationship, mankurtization, narrative genres, fiction, totalitarian system, wolf

#### *Introduction*

The protagonist of the Muhtar Avezov's ‘Kökserek’ story, which is fictionalized from a dominant point of view, is a male wolf named Kökserek. Kökserek, who was kidnapped from his lair when he was a baby, is entrusted to a child named Kurmaş in the village; “When he got up and started walking (by rooting), a rope was attached to his neck. It doesn't come out of the house. At night Kurmas would take him to bed with him” [1; 35]. There is a semantic relationship between Kökserek's neck rope and the Turkish people's captivity rope. Likewise, when Cengiz Aytmatov's novel Goodbye Gülsarı is read symbolically, the chain on the horse's foot and the rope around its neck are the phenomena of the understanding of enslaving the Turkish peoples [2].

The plot in the story can be explained as environmental and perceptual space. The environmental space is the wolf, where Kökserek struggles for life between existence and non-existence, the village and its surroundings where he finds himself when he is taken out of his lair. The vast steppe of Kazakhstan is another environmental space [3-5].

\* Corresponding author. E-mail address: oylemezo@kastamonu.edu.tr

Kökserek, from the first day he came to the village, "he is tortured by the dogs in the courtyard". The message that the author wants to convey here is his belief that the pressures on the Turkish peoples during the Soviet era will decrease or disappear completely over time. Even though Kökserek's sense of wolf is tried to be forgotten from the first moment he came to the village, the village elders believe that he will not lose his originality.

### *Methods*

The article uses the method of comparing text and discourse. Attempts have been made to identify similarities and differences between discourse and text. In relation to text and discourse, the British linguist G. Widdowson gives the definition that "discourse is the sum of text and situation, and text is the subtraction of situation from discourse".

In modern linguistics, there are many studies devoted to the types of discourse. V.I. Karasik divides the typology of discourse into three types: sociolinguistic (who speaks?), pragmalinguistic (as they say?), thematic (about what?) [6; 276-277].

In sociolinguistics, discourse focuses on personality and status. Personality — oriented discourse, in turn, is divided into daily and everyday discourse, and status-oriented discourse is divided into institutional and non-institutional discourse [6; 319-320].

Institutional discourse obliges the narrator to represent a particular social institution. Types of institutional discourse — political, military, medical, pedagogical, etc.

From the above, we can see that discourse is one of the most complex, multi-faceted and visible communities in various areas of human activity. J.R. Tolkien argues that the community itself is a discourse, and the discourse consists of a community ('community involved discourse and discussion involved community') [7; 21-22].

As you know, many of our scientists in the country are engaged in new research on the problem of discourse. For example, the scientist A.S. Adilova identifies the common features and differences between text and discourse [8; 16].

Doctor of philology, professor B.I. Nurdauletova and A.S. Nurzhanova in her article 'Concepts of discourse and discursive analysis' emphasized the relationship of discourse with text, the concepts of addressant/message/addressee. Young researcher Meruert Bazarbayeva in her article 'Artistic discourse in the works of bilingual writers' focuses on the history and cognition of discourse, discursology, categories of discourse of fiction: artistic text, author, reader, hyperbole.

Doctor of philology, professor A.S. Adilova clarified and proposed that due to the fact that discourse is a multi-faceted complex phenomenon, three main directions of its study are currently found in scientific circulation. It is: pragmalinguistic, dialogic and cultural studies. Due to the fact that the most basic component of discourse is communicants, researchers distinguish between personal discourse and institutional discourse, on the basis of which personal discourse itself is divided into artistic discourse (artistic, expressive, figurative expression of a person's perception of his own game, the world) and simple discourse (compensation for the need for everyday communication). And the types of institutional discourse involve taking into account the purpose of communication and the main character, often the place, of the state of communication, that is, if there is a religious discourse, it should be taken into account that the conversation, discussion of the imam and the believer, and it often takes place in a mosque, in the form of a sermon. There are several types of institutional discourse: journalistic, religious, pedagogical, administrative, medical, legal, political, military, advertising, scientific, etc. [8; 16].

### *Results and discussion*

Muhtar Avezov's "Kökserek" story, like Tölögön Kasimbekov's "Bozkurt" story, is based on the desire to turn the wolf out of its lair when people were kidnapped by people into a dog, and the wolf, who does not forget its origin, takes revenge on people [1]. The story must be thought of symbolically. The wolf is used in the story for the Turkish peoples whose origin is wanted to be forgotten in a symbolic sense, but which does not lose its original. The story will become clearer as the face of the wolf, which is an important value for the Turks, is understood from the past to the present.

The wolf is an important symbol for Turks. In many epics such as derivation and creation, it is said that Turks are descended from the wolf, the wolf motif has been kept alive in the myths from generation to generation, and today it has found the opportunity to live in narratives such as novels and stories. Mukhtar Avezov also did not remain indifferent to the importance of the wolf, which is considered sacred to the Turks, in

his story, he told the tragic story of the destruction of his lineage, taking into account the understanding of Russification / othering experienced by his own people. This holiness carried by the wolf is seen not only in Kazakhs but also in other Turkish world literatures. Kurd; it is the symbol of the Turkish nation with its nobility, freedom and never being subjugated. Avezov also used the wolf as a symbol in his story and took it into the center of his work, depending on his noble and free life instinct. The glorification of the wolf and its noble aspect is the presence of the semantic relationship that the author has established between the Turkish peoples and the wolf. The desire of a people to put a rope around their neck and the understanding of putting a rope around the neck of a wolf can be thought in the same direction. The transformation of the massacres and massacres committed by the Russians into an identity massacre that continued in cultural, political and social aspects after the establishment of the Soviet Union is symbolically handled in the story “Kökserek”.

The protagonist of the story, which is fictionalized from a dominant point of view, is a male wolf named Kökserek. Kökserek, who was kidnapped from his lair when he was a baby, is entrusted to a child named Kurmaş in the village; “When he got up and started walking (by rooting), a rope was attached to his neck. It doesn't come out of the house. At night Kurmas would take him to bed with him.” There is a semantic relationship between Kökserek's neck rope and the Turkish people's captivity rope. Likewise, when Cengiz Aytmatov's novel *Goodbye Gülsarı* is read symbolically, the chain on the horse's foot and the rope around its neck are the phenomena of the understanding of enslaving the Turkish peoples.

Kökserek, from the first day he came to the village, “he is tortured by the dogs in the courtyard” [1; 36]. The message that the author wants to convey here is his belief that the pressures on the Turkish peoples during the Soviet era will decrease or disappear completely over time. Even though Kökserek's sense of wolf is tried to be forgotten from the first moment he came to the village, the village elders believe that he will not lose his originality; “As he gets older, he gets proud and walks with his feet open. The elders who noticed this habit: Now it is necessary to kill it and take its skin; this infidel will not be tamed in the end, they said. But Kurmas did not agree.” The author's belief that the wolf will not be tamed, that is, it will not turn into a dog, and his belief that Turkish peoples cannot be marginalized can be evaluated on the same plane. The Turkish peoples, who have ontological sense of belonging but are trying to be alienated from the lands they live in, have struggled to exist against the oppression and assimilation policy they live in, and have not forgotten their origins even after years have passed.

Kurmaş's father realizes that he remembers the original of the wolf, which he sensed something strange for days; “Shit, this infidel's two eyes have turned green! This mascara sensed its origin. My child, he said, let's just kill this and take its skin off”. Kurmaş pays with his life for not heeding his father's warning. It is the belief that when the brutal murder of the child by Kökserek, whom he raised in his own hands, is interpreted in a symbolic sense, the consciousness of the society, which was put to sleep against the corruption/decay, will one day awaken.

The most important policy carried out during the Soviet era was the policy of divide-conquer. In this direction, Turkish peoples have been alienated from each other and exposed to the politics of de-identification, which has been removed from their sense of self in the temporal and spatial plane. The Soviet regime tried to create selfless apostles who thought like them. The new type of people that the Soviets want to create is Russian, their religion is Christianity, and their culture is Russian culture. This new Soviet type of man is no different from a slave who fulfills the requirements of the regime. However, the Turkish peoples, who were tried to be removed from their own roots, remembered their originals like “Kökserek” and did not turn into the docile/silent ‘mankurt’ they wanted to be likened to.

Kökserek, who escaped from the village without losing his sense of wolf, encounters a pack of wolves and takes over the leadership of the pack. The herd now takes action to take revenge on people who want to hunt themselves as dogs. “On the days when it was windy and frosty, they went into the fold a few times. There were also times when he went into the corral of a poor yard and only Kökserek killed about ten sheep and survived. Some of the dogs of several yards that were called “fights with wolves, brave and vigilant” were also eaten.” It is the nature of the wild that the wolf attacks the villages and harms the villagers. However, what Avezov wants to say in the story he constructed with symbols from beginning to end is different. As a result of the policies implemented to marginalize the Turkish peoples, many individuals have experienced loss of self. It is up to the intelligentsia to warn/awaken them. The intellectuals try to keep the national consciousness alive through their works. The awakened people revolt against the colonial mentality; “As long as the colonizer continues to see the person he exploits as an object and regards him as an animal, he himself acquires some inhuman characteristics. Ultimately, the colonizer is accepted by the exploited people. The relationship between them is such a destructive and creative one”. The relationship between Kökserek

and people turns into such a devastating life-and-death struggle. Also, the relationship with Kökserek with the mentality that wants to turn himself into a dog by escaping from his lair is like the relationship between a slave and a master. When Hegel says that slavery and mastery are not absolute roles, he says that slave and master can be replaced. As a matter of fact, the Nobel Prize-winning author of Turkish literature Orhan Pamuk, in his novel *Beyaz Kale*, metaphorically deals with the idea that slave and master can be exchanged in his novel. In the story, Kökserek's representation of Turkish peoples is related to the instinct of freedom he carries, besides being archetypically sacred for Turks from past to present. The struggle against enslavement is the phenomenon of a people's desire for independence.

The plot in the story can be explained as environmental and perceptual space. The environmental space is the wolf, where Kökserek struggles for life between existence and non-existence, the village and its surroundings where he finds himself when he is taken out of his lair. The vast steppe of Kazakhstan is another environmental space. However, perceptual spaces, which include the psychological analysis of the individual, are more important in story studies. Perceptual spaces make themselves felt in the bad experiences of the wolf from the first moment he came to the village; "Until then, Kökserek was tortured by the dogs in the yard. No dog sees him as a friend, does not let him near. The fearless wolfhounds attacking the wolf swoop over him. Other dogs snarl, sometimes attacking suddenly, biting all over with their teeth." The tortures of the offspring, who are left defenseless in the village and separated from their mother, turn the place into hell for the cub. For Kökserek in the story, the moments when the space becomes narrow and deadly is the attack he suffers at the end of the story. Kökserek, who died as a result of the attack of his owner with Akkaska, loses his struggle for existence; "Smash it!.. smash it!.. your mouth! Coming and saying, Kasen thrust the handle of the thick whip into Kökserek's throat and pressed it firmly, lifting his enemy's nose upwards. For Kökserek, whose realm of existence has been raped and who has been struggling to consume the human race from the first moment he was born, the intimacy space he experiences when he wanders freely in the steppe, encountering the siege of space, turns into a labyrinth space. From this point of view, the space in the story shows the feature of being a narrow/closed space.

When we look at the story on the temporal plane, it is seen that the author creates the story with a sequential time setup. Events take place within the framework of a certain occurrence. The protagonist of the story is a wolf as in the *Bozkurt* story. The story, which begins when Kökserek was kidnapped from his lair at the moment of his first birth, covers the times when Kökserek realizes himself and regains his freedom by returning to his origin. At the end of the story, the story ends when Kökserek is killed by people as a result of attacking the villages. The author temporally constructs the story with instantaneous temporal expressions without going back to flashbacks. It is seen that the time of the story is provided by daily transitions with temporal expressions such as "afternoon," "lunchtime," "midnight". Also, sharp transitions are seen in the story; "So by the middle of summer, Kökserek turned out to be a big male wolf." While it is meant to be explained that Kökserek has grown up with the expression; the expression "he lived alone during the summer" describes Kökserek's search for himself. In this way, the syntactic expressions that are followed throughout the story are provided with certain transitions in several places. Time is an important object of transformation for the development and self-discovery of the individual. In the story, Kökserek also realized himself in time despite being shut down and returned to his essence.

In the story, the most important theme that the author insists on is the concept of *mankurtization*/othering. The first starting point of the concept of *Mankurt* is the epic of *Manas*. However, it was Cengiz Aytmatov who brought the concept to the world literature by narrating it [2]. Aytmatov uses the concept of 'mankurt' for individuals who deny their originality and become callous and robotic.

*Mankurtization* is the loss of self-values of the individual and ontologically falling into the existential void of the individual. This decline is seen in the form of alienation of the individual from himself and the values of the society in which he lives. *Mankurtization* is a process of extinction in which the individual enters unconsciously, while *mankurtization* is a conscious devaluation and memory destruction process. Aytmatov's answer to Mukhtar Shahanov's question in the chapter entitled "Crime in the Shadow of the Centuries" of the *Scream of the Hunter in the Lamb's Head* shows that 'mankurtizm' is a deliberate ideological enslavement project; "During the time of the totalitarian system, an ideological poem was placed in the minds, ideas and understandings of all of us, including you and me. This was done to blindly tie and handcuff a regime" / Mukhtar Auezov, who, like Aytmatov, was a close witness of the era's identity erasure, also uses the wolf as a symbol in this story. The desire to make the wolf a dog and the enslavement of the peoples of the Turkic Republics follow a parallel course. The Turkish peoples, in terms of their languages, beliefs and his-

toricity, were tried to be detached from their values by the Soviet Union, and it was deliberately aimed to destroy the memory.

For example, the beliefs and thoughts of the Kyrgyz people, who were alienated from their own history, were banned, and a people's ties with nationality were tried to be severed. The epic of Manas of the Kyrgyz, which is not only a universal cultural heritage among the Kyrgyz, but also waited for years to be published with this understanding. Again, the collectivization approach applied to the Kazakhs in 1933 is an indicator of a systematic approach to mankurtization.

The individual, who is exposed to various tortures by destroying his memory in the process of being mankurt, moves away from his self-values in the process of extinction. However, in the story, the gray wolf was not defeated in this process and preferred to die by standing upright, even though he wanted to be turned into a dog. When societies are under ideological pressure, they either oppose it with a mass awakening or accelerate their extinction by yielding. The protagonist of the story, Kökserek, has not changed his stance against the desire to destroy the sense of wolf from the first moment he was brought to the village, and has not lost his originality. A connection can be established between Kökserek's not straying from his wolf feeling and the preservation of Turkish identity. Turkish rights, who were subjected to all kinds of oppression and persecution by the Soviets, have endured the policy of de-identification for years, and have been subjected to marginalization by deeply experiencing the fear of losing their "Turkish" identity. Turkish rights, which were tried to be marginalized until they became fully independent in 1991, returned to their essence/identity after gaining their independence.

Narrative genres such as novels and stories, which are fictions of reality, are told in a way that reflects the society in which they live. Auezov also chose the characters he dealt with in his stories from real life, and built the events on experiences or livability. The author establishes a semantic link between the understanding of 'dogification' that he deals with in the story and the "Russification" process of his people. T. Kasimbekov's "Bozkurt" story is also fictionalized on the dog's canineization of the wolf. The common destiny of Kazakh and Kyrgyz people is similar in this sense. The Kazakh people, who are tried to be detached from their own values and tried to be russified, struggle for existence for years. People who try to hold on to life on the thin line between death and life are pushed away from their essence by being stuck within the borders drawn by the Regime. Othering emerges as a result of such a break.

### *Conclusion*

As a result, when the story "Kökserek" is read symbolically, it is a story that reveals the ontological process of the Turkish peoples and conveys messages to the universe. In today's world, the individual who breaks away from the traditional way of life becomes alienated from the society he lives in and enters a chaotic extinction process. In this process of destruction, which can be defined as corruption, the individual is in danger of losing his position in the universe by entering into conflict with himself and his environment. The individual who goes out of social norms, degenerates by moving away from his roots and values; He experiences an instinctive trauma by going out of cultural and social life. This process, which can also be described as amnesia, is also a precursor to social decay such as lack of communication and alienation. Corruption is not destiny but transformation. Therefore, "corruption cannot be an element that makes change and transformation impossible." It is up to the individual to return to the original. The individual who rejects the life imposed on him can go beyond the borders by protecting his values. By postponing the blindness of corruption, it can assure its own existence.

### *References*

- 1 Auezov M. Yolun Açık Olsun. Tanrı Dağlarının Zirvesi Aytmatov / M. Auezov; Editörler: Orhan Söylemez, Kemal Göz, Halit Aşlar. — Ankara: Bengü Yayınları, 2021.
- 2 Aytmatov C., Muhtar A. Şafak Sancısı. (Çev. Damira İbragim) / C. Aytmatov, A. Muhtar. — Ankara: Bengü Yayınları, 2015.
- 3 Çınar A. Muhtar Avezov ve Sanatının Kaynağı / A. Çınar // Bilig. — 1997. — Vol. 5. — P. 11-19.
- 4 Koç K., İşina A., Korganbekov B. Kazak Edebiyatı 2 / K. Koç, A. İşina, B. Korganbekov. — İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2007.
- 5 Söylemez O., Azap S. Türk Dünyası Edebiyatları Hikâye Çözümlemeleri / O. Söylemez, S. Azap İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları, 2020.
- 6 Карасик В. И. Языковая спираль: ценности, знаки, мотивы / В.И. Карасик. — Волгоград: Парадигма, 2015. — 431 с.

- 7 Carpenter H. (1977). *Tolkien: A Biography* / H. Carpenter. — New York: Ballantine Books, 1997.  
8 Адилова А. Қабылдау стилистикасы / А. Адилова. — Алматы, Эверо, 2016. — 99 б.

О. Сойлемез, О. Фарук Атеш

### М. Әуезовтің «Көксерек» әңгімесіндегі мәнгүрт бейнесі

Мақалада Мұхтар Әуезовтің «Көксерек» әңгімесі арқылы мәнгүрттік тақырыбы ашылған. Мәнгүрттік — бұл адамның өзіндік құндылықтарының жоғалуы және адамның экзистенциалды бос орнына онтологиялық құлдырау. Бұл құлдырау адамның өзінен және өзі өмір сүретін қоғамның құндылықтарынан алшақтау түрінде көрінеді. Мәнгүрттік — бұл жеке адам бейсаналық түрде енетін жойылу процесі. Тоталитарлық жүйе кезінде түркі халықтарының идеологиялық кеңістігін өшіруге тырысты. Кеңес заманында қасқырды (түркілерді) итке (құлға) айналдыру (мәнгүрттендіру саясаты) жүргізілді. Жазушы қасқырды осы оқиғаның символы ретінде пайдаланады. Зерттеуде салыстырмалы талдау, дискурсивті анализ, контент-анализ әдістері қолданылды. Авторлар зерттеудің нәтижесінде «қасқыр» бейнесі арқылы түркі халықтары бостандығы, ұлттық құндылықтарды, рухани қуатты символдаған деген қорытынды жасайды.

*Кілт сөздер:* Мұхтар Әуезов, семантикалық қатынастар, мәнгүрттік, баяндау жанрлары, көркем әдебиет, тоталитарлық жүйе, қасқыр.

О. Сойлемез, О. Фарук Атеш

### Образ мангурта в рассказе «Серый Лютый» («Көксерек») М. Ауэзова

В статье раскрыта тема манкуртизации на примере рассказа Мухтара Ауэзова «Серый лютый». Авторами доказано, что манкуртизация — это потеря самооценности индивида. Пустота, в которой он оказывается, рассмотрена в онтологическом смысле. Этот упадок проявляется в форме отчуждения человека от самого себя и ценностей общества, в котором он живет. Манкуртизация — это процесс угасания, в который индивид вступает бессознательно. Авторами обосновано мнение о последствиях тоталитарной системы в ее попытках стереть идеологическое пространство тюркских народов; о том, как проводилось превращение (политика манкуртизации) волка (тюрок) в собаку (раба). Мухтар Ауэзов использует волка как символ этого события. В исследовании использованы методы сравнительного анализа, дискурсивного анализа, контент-анализа. В результате авторами сделан вывод относительно того, что образ «волка» символизирует свободу, национальные ценности и духовную силу тюркского народа.

*Ключевые слова:* Мухтар Ауэзов, семантические отношения, манкуртизация, повествовательные жанры, художественная литература, тоталитарная система, волк.

#### References

- 1 Auezov, M. (2021). *Yolun Açık Olsun. Tanrı Dağlarının Zirvesi Aytmatov* [Godspeed. The peak of the Mountains of God Aytmatov]. (Orhan Söylemez, Kemal Göz, Halit Aşlar, Eds.). Ankara: Bengü Yayınları [in Turkish].
- 2 Aytmatov, C., & Muhtar, A. (2015). *Şafak Sancısı* [The Throes of Dawn]. (Çev. Damira İbragim). Ankara: Bengü Yayınları [in Turkish].
- 3 Çınar, A. (1997). Muhtar Avezov ve Sanatının Kaynağı [Mukhtar Auezov and the Source of His Art]. *Bilig*, 5, 11-19 [in Turkish].
- 4 Koç, K., İşina, A., & Korganbekov, B. (2007). *Kazak Edebiyatı 2* [Kazakh Literature 2]. İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık [in Turkish].
- 5 Söylemez, O., Azap, S. (2020). *Türk Dünyası Edebiyatları Hikâye Çözümlemeleri*. İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları [in Turkish].
- 6 Karasik, V.I. (2015). *Yazykovaia spiral: tsennosti, znaki, motivy* [The language spiral: values, signs, motives]. Volgograd: Paradigma [in Russian].
- 7 Carpenter, Humphrey (1977). *Tolkien: A Biography*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- 8 Adilova, A. (2016). *Qabyldau stilistikasy* [Stylistics of perception]. Almaty: Evero [in Kazakh].