

## Wolf Imagery in London's *White Fang* and Aitmatov's *Plakha*

Kuttybayev SHOKANKHAN<sup>1</sup>, Kassym BALKIYA<sup>2</sup>, Issayeva Zhazira ISAYEVNA<sup>3</sup>, Koblanova AİMAN<sup>4</sup>, Moldagali BAKYTGUL<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN  
ORCID: 0000-0002-3455-9211

<sup>2</sup> Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN  
ORCID: 0000-0002-5375-387X

<sup>3</sup> Khoja Ahmet Yasawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkestan, KAZAKHSTAN  
ORCID: 0000-0001-9801-8943

<sup>4</sup> Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN  
ORCID: 0000-0002-1246-7690

<sup>5</sup> Corresponding Author, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN  
bahados\_@mail.ru  
ORCID: 0000-0002-1916-2371

### Article information

Submission	29/11/2023	Revision received	17/03/2024
Acceptance	14/04/2024	Publication date	28/04/2024

### Keywords:

wolf,  
myths,  
folk literature,  
Aitmatov  
Jack London

**Abstract:** This comparative study looks into the image of the wolf in Genghis Aitmatov's *Plakha* and Jack London's *White Fang*. For this purpose, first, the concept of the wolf in fiction is discussed, and the representation of wolves in these two texts is analyzed. This study explores the relationship between wolves and human beings as expressed in the texts in a way that helps understand the image of the wolf with specific cultural beliefs and practices that find aspirations in the text mentioned. The study concludes that Aitmatov associates Kazakh people with the wolf, unlike London's wolf, whose existence does not center around issues of freedom and independence.

### Anahtar Sözcükler:

Kurt,  
mit,  
halk edebiyatı,  
Aytmatov,  
Jack London

**London'ın *Beyaz Diş* ve Aytmatov'un *Dişi Kurdun Rüyalari* Eserlerinde Kurt İmgesi**

**Özet:** Bu karşılaştırmalı çalışmada, Cengiz Aytmatov'un *Dişi Kurdun Rüyası* ve Jack London'ın *Beyaz Diş* romanlarındaki kurt imgesi incelenmektedir. Bu amaçla, öncelikle yazınsal kurguda kurt kavramı ele alınmış ve bu iki metinde kurtların temsili incelenmiştir. Bu çalışma, kurt imgesini, sözü edilen metinlerde yer aldıkları özelliklerle ve belirli kültürel inanç ve uygulamalarla ilişkilendirecek şekilde irdelerken kurtlar ve insanlar arasındaki ilişkiyi dilsel ve kültürel boyutlarıyla ele almaktadır. Çalışma, Aytmatov'un Kazak halkını bağımsızlık ve özgürlüklerine düşkün kurtlarla özdeşleştirdiğini göstermektedir ki bu da London'ın kurt imgesi ile tezat teşkil eder.

**To Cite This Article:** Shokankhan, K., Balkiya, K., Isayevna, I. Z., Aiman, K., & Bakytgul, M. (2024). Wolf Imagery in London's *White Fang* and Aitmatov's *Plakha* novels. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 18(1), 88–98. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10987243>

## 1. Introduction

In contemporary fiction, “animals and plants lead precarious lives, caught in geopolitical tensions and cross-border antagonisms” (Pramod, 2023, p. 6). Despite the current problematic appearance of these non-human entities in various texts, the representation of animals in fiction and non-fiction began in the earliest times, as can be seen in the works of Aristotle and Aesop, and such texts as Panchatantra and Marzban-nama (Arikan, 2011) mainly because for many writers, the description of natural phenomena including the animals has significant repercussions. From a theoretical perspective, while reading the ideas, landscapes, metaphors, and symbols created by the author can be taken both as an outcome of the individual as well as social reality (Maydangaliyeva et al., 2018), the historical development of such continuous literary portrayals necessitates further examination and thorough analysis so that literary texts are examined from various historical and cultural perspectives.

Among many animals, the wolf has a special place in fiction mainly because the wolf has a unique way of life and character compared to other untamed animals. The image of the wolf served as a symbolic background in the works of writers in the true description of human life and its fate full of struggle. This is evidenced by Jack London's novel *White Fang*, in which he impressively portrays wolf dogs (Yang, 2015, pp. 42-46). From another corner, Genghis Aitmatov's novel *Plakha* can be mentioned as a well-known work about wolves of Central Asia. Although both texts incorporate the image of the wolf, a comparative study has not been conducted to show the symbolic depth of the image of the wolf, as it was created by two different authors from two different places on Earth. Hence, this article provides a comparative analysis of these texts to reveal the representation of the image of the wolf from a cultural perspective.

### 1.1. Literature Review

The image of the wolf, found in the mythical and folk literature of various people from various cultures and nations, has always been a popular image with various qualities attached to it. The image of the wolf has always been a topic of discussion and a matter of representation in arts and literature.

#### 1.1.2. *Turkic people's understanding of the wolf*

A wolf is a predatory animal. That is, he is the owner of a creature created to take the lives of others to live. Wolves are “field sanitary workers” who help to maintain balance in the ecological law in nature (Kazakhstan National Encyclopedia, 2003, p. 661). Wolves live in pairs, and for many Turkic peoples, they are free animals of the wilderness that do not get used to handling at all. Living in packs of 25-30 members, no matter how many wolves there are in the group, they obey the pack's leader (Abadan or Arlan) (Kazakhstan National Encyclopedia, 2003, p. 661). No matter how hungry they are, they will not go on any journey without the leader of the herd. Aitmatov describes this bond by writing, “Everyone is following Akkurtk's command” (2005, p. 319).

Wolves guard their territory strictly. They visit their territory every two or three days and leave their dung to ensure that others acknowledge their territorial power, as this practice develops as early as their puppyhood. Thus, Turkic people believe that wolves are symbols of courage and patience, and many of their historical legends exemplify this. Similarly, while the name of the ethnic group “Bashkir” means “the head wolf”, Tatars believe that they

descended from the "white wolf". Also, the word "Bori" has a broad meaning among the Turkic people (Kazakhstan National Encyclopedia, 1999, p. 33), another legend says:

Peaceful Turks will be destroyed by the state of Lin. Only a 10-year-old boy survives. Enemies did not hesitate to kill the child; they cut off his legs and arms and threw himself into the lake. A she-wolf finds him and feeds him with meat. Later, the enemies will find out and try to kill the wolf and the child. But the wolf took the boy to the Altai mountain and ran away to find ten of them, and later, they became a country of ten tribes. The smartest of the sons is elected leader and becomes Bori (Ashina). (Kazakhstan National Encyclopedia, 1999, p. 33)

The root cause of Turkic peoples claiming to be the descendants of blue wolves may be that wolves do not like to live dependent on others. For Turkic peoples, the most important characteristic of wolves is their loyalty towards their pack members. Kazakh saying about their loyalty can be seen in the saying, "A wolf does not hate his friend" (Kazakh proverbs and sayings, 2013, p. 95). Furthermore, the pair can only survive for a few months when a pack member dies. More importantly, they do not leave their pack members in their old age. Hence, such qualities of wolves have traditionally made Turkic people admire the wolf as many proverbs and sayings exemplify this sentiment, such as: "We are descendants of the coyote, we were raised by the coyote who gave us its white milk", "Wolves don't show their thinness, don't hide their fur", "Man's food and wolf's food are always on the road." Similarly, "In the song of the Kazakh heroes, the warriors who are going to defend themselves from the thick Kalmyks wear blue armour and hold a blue spear in their hands, and when they see the enemy, they growl like a hungry wolf as they rush forward" (Kanatbayeva, 2004, p. 45).

It is difficult to find themes of the subjugation of wolves in Kazakh legends. Even a tiger or a lion may obey a man's orders, but an obeying wolf is almost unheard. As Murtaza (2002) writes: "A blue wolf cub cannot adapt to a human like a dog. He does not bark or whimper. He grieves only for God in heaven. He obeys only that" (p. 53). This shows that the wolf is a beast that loves freedom, a sentiment that has been foregrounded in the literary works of many Turkic people.

## **2. Methods and Discussion**

### **2.1. Characterization of the Image of the Wolf in Fiction**

Jack London's *White Fang* and Aitmatov's *Plakha* are two important works that represent the wolf in detail, often symbolically criticizing the political atmosphere of the authors in their countries. In Aitmatov's *Plakha*, the balance of nature is shifted towards the worse in the hands of evil characters, although the good is also damaged regardless of their innocence (Gökalp Alpaslan, 2013). Aitmatov's ecological sensitivity in this novel points to his courageous political self-positioning since, during his lifetime, literature was strictly controlled and used as a tool for spreading communist views. Thus, it can also be claimed that writers like Aitmatov, who were well aware of such a propagandistic process, took various animals, including the wolf, to represent humans through the existence of non-humans.

### **2.2. Characteristic features of London's "Aq Azu" and Aitmatov's Tasshaynar and Akkurtkas**

As a predator, the wolf preys on the weaker, threatening others for its own life. Their life is a small quantity of a mystery for the typical reader. Moreover, Aitmatov's Tasshaynar and Akkurtkasy, London's *White Fang* are depicted in the works of art as beings who can think

like a human and know how to be sad and happy, even if they do not speak. Through this, he tries to give the reader some information about the wolf. As wolf, Aq Azu, Tasshainar, and Akkurtka have typical harmonies characteristic of steppe thrones, although one inhabits America and the other Central Asia. According to Gökalp Alpaslan (2013),

In the novel, a few human stories are told concurrently with the lives of the female wolf, Akbar and her mate, Taşçaynar. While topics such as belief, money, and good vs. evil are evoked along with social problems, the novel's primary focus is on Akbar and, accordingly, on nature. The novel presents a bleak outlook on environmental issues and the destruction of nature by human impact, an elegy to the loss of natural values, and a warning for nature's impending vengeance. (p. 2)

In both works, the image of the wolf is depicted artistically, trying to show that it is a wolf and a straight throne. For example, London "*He was a fierce little cub. His tiny rages were much more terrible than theirs*" (London, 1960, p. 44). In this illustration, the behaviour of the ancestor of the squirrel, which has just scratched its eyes open, shows that it is a fierce field throne. But although *White Fang* is depicted as the most angry among his fellows, the future eagle who does not make himself easy prey for others, his actions when he first meets people are different:

As the hand descended closer and closer, there raged within the cub a battle of the instincts. He experienced two great impulses to yield and to fight. The resulting action was a compromise. He did both. He yielded until the hand almost touched him. Then he fought, his teeth flashing in a snap that sank them into the hand. The next moment he received a clout beside the head that knocked him over on his side. Then all the fight fled from him. His puppyhood and the instinct of submission took charge of him. He sat up on his haunches and ki-yi'd. But the man whose hand he had bitten was angry. The cub received a clout on the other side of his head. Whereupon he sat up and ki-yi'd louder than ever. (London, 1960, p. 62)

This description by the writer shows that the wolves that inhabited the American continent are helpless in front of humanity. There is not even the stubbornness and stubbornness worthy of a field throne as a puppy. Even at the first meeting, he immediately went to the garden without showing any effort following the conditions of the field. When he first saw people and snarled at them, the Indians were not afraid of them: "When *White Fang* meets people for the first time, he snarls at people who try to pet him. They said, 'Kiche!'" (London, 1960, p. 63). Hence, *White Fang*'s ultimate weapon, its emerald teeth, brings joy, not fear, to the Indians. Even his mother, who defeated the fierce lynx, is depicted as a kind being:

And then the cub saw his mother, the she-wolf, the fearless one, crouching down until her belly touched the ground, whimpering, wagging her tail, making peace signs. The cub could not understand. He was appalled. The awe of man rushed over him again. His instinct had been true. His mother verified it. She, too, rendered submission to the man-animals. (London, 1960, p. 63)

The she-wolf's caressing whining without showing resistance to humanity, which considers itself the master of the world, contradicts the concept of wolves as a symbol of cruelty and freedom. Obviously, these wolves consider human beings superior to them, bow down when they see them, and show that the Earth brothers accept their dominance over them. The principles of living and the way of life of Tashchainar and Akkurtka, who lived in the vast Kazakh Sahara described by Aitmatov, are even different from Aq Azu. They are faithful to the law of the field, coming from their distant ancestors, and the great feeling that resides in

their chests, they do not want to be trampled on by anyone. Akkurtkka and Tasshainar's first meeting with bipeds is impressive:

... At that moment, Akkurtkka had already noticed the danger to his soldiers. A naked man basked in the sunset pink sunlight of the field snarled. It was easy for him to bite that person's throat or stomach with his diamond-like fangs. But when the wolf saw the blood, the poor man, whose urine had gone to the bottom of the urinal, covered his head with his hands and sat down to protect himself. While rushing to Akkurtkka, he changed his mind. He cursed the person who was sitting down. (Aitmatov, 2005, p. 14)

The wolves depicted by Aitmatov are not like "Aq Azu" of London, but they were able to suppress human anger even at the first meeting. There is great significance in the fact that a cockroach curses a person without harming him. Here is a warning to the people who live in the nomadic Kazakh land. That is to say, he shows a rebellious character that does not easily interfere with his place of residence and life, as well as his internal principles. Therefore, the portraits of the wolves described by the two writers are opposite each other. If London's "White Fang" gives the idea that a predator can be tamed, a semi-animal can be made close to a human being, Aitmatov's wolf is the most arrogant; he will never get used to being tamed; he cannot depend on someone.

At the same time, there are contradictions in the actions of the wolves in the two stories. Along the *White Fang* of London, a great werewolf awakens, leaves the village, and goes to his home in the forest, but the journey does not last long. His heart does not argue with continuing to follow the centuries-old principle of ancestors, which is to look for food worthy of the field's throne to endure hunger. Longing for the daily life near that village and the bones offered by the master, he deviates from the path of his ancestors and returns to the same life of subservience to the master. "The code he learned was to obey the strong and to oppress the weak. Gray Beaver was a god, and strong. Therefore, White Fang obeyed him" (London, 1960, p. 80). In other words, they lost the freedom characteristic of wolves and got used to living like village dogs. He forgot that he was a free animal of the field and lost the nature given to him by the Creator.

Akkurtkka and Tasshainar, in Aitmatov's novel *Plakha*, did not stop fighting with people to preserve the law of steppe wolves. Even the wolves in Aitmatov's depiction are depicted as creatures that cause fear in humans and sprinkle deadly poison on those who come face to face with them. It is described that "Akkurtkka was the leader, minder, and hunter of this bloodthirsty couple, and Tasshainar was the dark force, reliable support, supporter" (Aitmatov, 2005, p. 8). Even a fight between two wolves can lead to a great conversation between people:

And they say that Akkurtkka and Tasshainar are wolves. A trained eye could immediately distinguish these from local wolves. Because the orange colour from the neck to the crown, from the liver to the back is a sign that they are the real field throne. And if someone looked closely at Akkurtkka's eyes, they would be surprised that he was blue-eyed. This is a very rare phenomenon among wolves, perhaps not at all. (Aitmatov, 2005, p. 9)

In the novel, Akkurtkka and Tasshainar are wolves who lost their homeland from the kicks of bipeds and suffered a lot. They also lost their separation from humans. However, even though he was saddened by the loss of his children and his fatherland, nothing could calm down their bravery, worthy of the throne of the field. No matter how many exiled wolves there are, they will not stop trampling on the local predators. No matter how open he was, he did not know how to bow down to human beings. The writer describes the wolf's actions

by saying: "Especially the blue-eyed Akkurtkka was born arrogant and was not born to depend on anyone" (Aitmatov, 2005, p.10).

In this way, the trait of the female Akkurtkka, who does not show her weaknesses in front of others, teaches alien predators to treat them with respect. In the novel, Akkurtkka and Tasshainar put their principles of life and honour first, no matter how much they suffer. It shows they are the natural successors of the blue wolf described in legends. People who inhabited the Kazakh Moyynkum Sahara since ancient times, who have not lost their ancient order and principles no matter how many generations have changed, leave the steppe where they were born and grew up in the destruction of Tasshaynar and Akkurtkka. Among the locals, however, their fame is spread: "The name of the Arlan is Tasshainar, its strength is incalculable, it will knock down your name itself. Moreover, his blood is Akkurtkka - his mother; he goes to Sungyla when he is smart! That is why it is very dangerous" (Aitmatov, 2005, p. 219), the information spreads. London's *White Fang* is utterly different from Akkurtkka and Tasshainar. *White Fang*'s life was spent among people, obeying their principles of order:

By it he had been formed and hardened into the Fighting Wolf, fierce and implacable, unloving and unlovable. To accomplish the change was like reflux of being, and this when the plasticity of youth was no longer his; when the fibre of him had become tough and knotty; when the warp and the woof of him had made of him an adamant texture, harsh and unyielding; when the face of his spirit had become iron and all his instincts and axioms had crystallized into set rules, cautions, dislikes, and desires. (London, 1960, p. 134)

He was just getting used to the law of life; a young Arlan freely learned the order and law in place of people and began to adapt himself to live in that way, i.e., "He had learned control and poise, and he knew the law. He achieved a staidness, and calmness, and philosophical tolerance" (London, 1960, p. 160). Of course, he will not have a hostile attitude towards the new master because he has buried his life principles at the bottom of his heart. Not only did *White Fang* get used to being among people, but he now aimed to become a reliable companion of people: "And so, because he needed a god and because he preferred Weedon Scott to Beauty Smith, *White Fang* remained as he proceeded to take upon himself the guardianship of his master's property" (London, 1960, p. 134). Thus, the portrayal of the wolves in the two works is different. If London portrays his wolf as an animal that can be tamed and submissive to humans, Aitmatov's wolves are entirely different because they remain wild beasts living only by the law of wilderness, not submissive to humans. In short, Aitmatov's wolves try to preserve their way of wildlife without compromising with humans.

### 2.3. Differences in Dreams of Wolves in Works

Both London and Aitmatov tried to convey their dreams while describing wolves, depicting their actions by analysing their psychological states. In Aitmatov's novel *Plakha*, Akkurtkka and Tasshainar, unable to find shelter in the vast Kazakh Sahara of Moyynkum, left for Afghanistan and found refuge at one end of the Issykkol mountains, but their love for their homeland, the vast Sahara, did not disappear from their minds. For example, "... *if Akkurtk remembered his past life, many tears came to his blue eyes, he would sigh, maybe he would speak*" (Aitmatov, 2005, p. 10). In addition to Akkurtkka's longing for his native land, his anguish when people steal his puppies, and seeing his puppies in his dreams while he sleeps, he imagines a person in the form of a beast, and this image is given by dreaming:

It came down at night. He dreams of an akkuratka. In the dream, her puppies are with her, this sister. They are scared and fighting for their nipples. It's ugly, What a time to give milk to these babies, and the nipples hurt... but the milk does not decrease... The worm was worried, wondering why my milk does not ease, why my puppies are not satisfied. (Aitmatov, 2005, p. 274)

Therefore, even if the mother wolf loses her children, as a mother, she does not want to suffer this tragedy. His inner world was conquered by his longing and love for his children. It is also said that "He is still in Moyynkum and the desert. He has four puppies by his side; he flies without running on them" (Aitmatov, 2005, p. 10). No matter how many hardships he is struggling with, he has never forgotten his homeland, neither in his dreams nor in his mind. His grief at losing his friends and his homeland seems to be blowing the embers of his grief.

The wolves played by Aitmatov cannot accept the demands of the new age and the changes in their lives. Unable to accept what is happening around him, he is forced to leave his place:

There is no one in the old place, there are no people left. But even then, the wolves are still wary: if such an analogy is appropriate, it is as if they were walking through minefields. With every step they took, their sinister, foreign smell came to rest on something: ashes from bonfires, empty tins from cans, broken glass, the poisonous smell of rubber and metal left behind by a truck, everywhere - empty bottles with the smell of vodka. Now they are going to abandon this completely forbidden place. (Aitmatov, 2005, p. 214)

It feels as if the sacred place where these wolves spent their whole lives has been lost in one day. To preserve the way of life of the future generation, he is proud to breed in this field, which the hands of people have soiled. This showed that the wolves played by Aitmatov did not submit to change and wanted their lives not to be destroyed. They even have to leave their homeland to fulfil their wishes. They howl about their troubles like a real wild wolf. Aitmatov describes the meaning of this snail to the reader as follows:

A worm's howl was heard, followed by a grunting sound as if coming from a cave. At first, their cry was filled with boiling anger and fear, then it turned into crying, and then it turned into anger and revenge, and then it turned into pitiful begging and sadness. (Aitmatov, 2005, p. 225)

Here, in these descriptions, there is a voice of wild predator wolves, not whining like a dog but protesting against the destruction of the environment in which they live. The dream of the wolf in London's *White Fang* is completely different. Wolves, played by Aitmatov, are truly wild animals that take revenge for every harm done to them and dream of freedom as much as possible. Of course, as a part of the wild nature, *White Fang* also had a hard time adapting to a new life. "He never chummed with other dogs. Lonely he had lived, so far as his kind was concerned, and lonely he would continue to live" (London, 1960, p.159). But, like a wild wolf, he went to the edge of the forest and showed through the snail that he had a straight throne and his habits left from that life. Only sometimes he would go to the edge of the forest, take out his belly and howl" (London, 1960, p. 90). Therefore, Aq Azu began to adapt to the new life.

However, *White Fang*'s wolf traits were not wholly lost. For example, the behavior of his owner, Weedon Scott, before moving to San Francisco, is characteristic of wolves. Begging with its beak pointing to the sky is indeed the action of a field throne:

That night he lifted the long wolf-howl. As he had howled, in his puppy days, when he fled back from the Wild to the village to find it vanished and naught but a rubbish heap to mark the site

of Gray Beaver's tepee, so now he pointed his muzzle to the cold stars and told them his woe. (London, 1960, p. 143)

However, this action does not fully reveal the characteristics of White Fang as a wolf. He does not look at the sky like a real straight throne, as played by Aitmatov. White Fang was seen looking for warmth in the crowd. Even though he is not only a reliable helper, the bravery that saved him from death is more like the behaviour of a dog loyal to its master than a field throne. Gradually, he turned into a domesticated animal that replaced the love for the homeland and traditions with respect for the owner. Thus, White Fang has adopted a new life and dreams of living this new life happily with his owner. He cannot even stand life without a master. For example, when his service in the South is over, Weedon Scott packs up to go to his hometown of San Francisco. White Fang can sense in advance that the master is going on a long journey and will not return, even though he has no language:

The next day White Fang's anxiety and restlessness were even more pronounced. He dogged his master's heels whenever he left the cabin, and haunted the front stoop when he remained inside. Through the open door, he could catch glimpses of the luggage on the floor. The grip had been joined by two large canvas bags and a box. Matt was rolling the master's blankets and fur robe inside a small tarpaulin. White Fang whined as he watched the operation. (London, 1960, p. 144)

This plot suggests that White Fang has become a part of his master's, Weedon Scott's, life. Even Whedon Scott left White Fang with his servant Matt, and the writer described the behaviour of White Fang when they closed the door behind him:

White Fang was howling as dogs howl when their masters lie dead. He was voicing an utter woe, his cry bursting upward in great, heart-breaking rushes, dying down into quavering misery, and bursting upward again with a rush upon a rush of grief. (London, 1960, p.144)

These descriptions alone convey with inner anguish that White Fang cannot accept life without Whedon Scott, and even if it does happen, he will not be able to accept this pain as though Whedon Scott is now his mate from the wolf pack. Thus, like Aitmatov's Akkurtk, London's wolf is very fond of him. Even the self-abandonment, throwing up because he rejected her, is beautifully depicted with symbolic undertones: "White Fang had stopped eating, lost heart, and allowed every dog of the team to thrash him. In the cabin, he lay on the floor near the stove, without interest in food, in Matt, nor life." (London, 1960, p. 138). Aq Azu wanted to live happily in a "civilized society" with his owner (Yang, 2015, p. 43). Therefore, it is clear that the dreams of the two wolves in the two works are quite different. Aitmatov's wolves refuse to reject their homeland and migrate. London's *White Fang*, on the other hand, wants to be faithful to its owner and live with him forever, unlike the wolf in Aitmatov's text.

#### **2.4. Relationship of Wolves with People in Two Works**

A wolf has always been a wild beast of prey for humans. It is clear that the representation of wolves in fiction and how they interact with humans arouses readers' interest. Aitmatov's and London's wolves have two different attitudes towards human beings and their relationship with them. Born and raised in the Kazakh steppe, Akkurtk and Tasshainar, who were forced to leave their home due to the impact of humans on nature, will be highly respected by the reader for not losing their wolf identity. The writer even describes their departure from the Kazakh steppe: "*This was the last desperate attempt of wolves to procreate*" (Aitmatov, 2005, p. 216). Wolves chose to migrate all their lives, thinking of raising their offspring in freedom. They face people many times on the way. Coming to a new place and



suffering from the road, he experiences difficult times. On the way, he loses his companions. With the characteristics typical of a wolf, he tries to take revenge on people for the death of his companions as follows:

Akkurtka and Tasshainar, who were startled by the sound of the gun, went to the gorge, intending to spend the rest of the night there. These two bastards don't even have a permanent home anymore, they spend the night anywhere. Akkurtka is ahead as usual. The types of fur in front of flowers are scary. His eyes shine like phosphors at night, his tongue is slurred - you'll think he's mad. (Aitmatov, 2005, p. 303)

This was Akkurtka's appearance when he lost his parts. The two eyes, filled with anger, did not stop, no matter how much they slaughtered the village's livestock.

Akkurtka, who wanted to take revenge for his children, did not deny his vindictive nature of a wolf; even if he lost his faithful companion, Tasshainar, he did not deny his original principle. Thus, to take revenge on people, Akkurtka Bostan kidnaps Kenjesh, the shepherd's son. However, the writer does not make the wolf suffer from human abuse. That is, a young boy will be killed by a man, not by a wolf. A shepherd trying to shoot a wolf shoots his child along with the wolf. Therefore, even though the wolf tried to take revenge, Aitmatov did not make the wolf do the torture that the man did to the wolf. However, he skillfully conveys the fact that even when the wolf is on the verge of death, he can scare people with his fierce gaze:

Not believing his eyes, Bostan looked at his son, who was covered in blood and slowly picked him up. He was surprised by the blue eyes of Kurtka, who, for some unknown reason, was about to die, clutching his brother, and then retreated. (Aitmatov, 2005, p. 316)

Through this scene, the writer's death of his child at the hands of a man and the action of a determined wolf who does not give up on anyone even when he is on the verge of death increase the philosophical content of the work. *White Fang's* attitude towards people in London is entirely different. *White Fang* is a loyal servant of humankind, his master. For example:

*White Fang* allowed all the members of the family to pet him and make much of him, but he never gave to them what he gave to the master. No caress of theirs could put the love croon into his throat, and, try as they would, they could never persuade him into snuggling against them. (London, 1960, p. 153)

This description shows that *White Fang* is obedient only to his master. His actions in the writer's image are described as a servant who obeys only Scott's orders and does not accept anyone else. The tenacious attitude towards the wolf in this place seems to be influenced by the principle of loyalty to one's master.

*White Fang* also learns how to adapt to a new life and how to interact with people from his master. "He had learned to laugh. Likewise, he learned to Rome with the master" (London, 1960, p. 160). This completely contradicted *White Fang's* savage nature towards humans. She was so devoted to Scott that one day, when her horse spooked and fell from the field, *White Fang* almost lost his life when he saw her. A horse that has killed its owner in a fit of anger will try to take it by the throat. Only his owner's screams stop him from doing so. Thus, not wanting to leave his owner, he ran home and looked for someone to help him:

At this moment speech came to White Fang, rushing up in a great burst of barking. "Something has happened to Weedon," his wife said decisively. They were all on their feet now, and White Fang ran down the steps, looking back for them to follow. (London, 1960, p. 163)

White Fang's loyalty to his owner not only makes him bark like a dog but even makes him speak like a human. Moreover, his rescue from the bloody hands of the criminal Jim Hall will increase his fame. Because no matter how much White Fang proved his loyalty to his master, it was a remarkable feat to save his life from a criminal. With the courage characteristic of a wolf, he instantly killed the criminal. Weedon Scott's boasting of such a feat: "No mere dog could have done what he did" (London, 1960, p. 169), was an objective assessment of Aq Azu, who was devoted to him. Thus, the wolves in the two works have different attitudes towards people. In Aitmatov's work, wolves are tortured by humans and die on the way to revenge. Even on the verge of death, he can scare people with his eyes. Moreover, the White Fang of London adapts to living with humans. He also uses his stubborn character to develop the skills of loyal service to his master.

### 3. Conclusion

The image of wolves in the description of two writers, who considered the relationship between people and wolves from a particular angle, has a deep symbolic background. In London's novel, *White Fang* is a carnivore, but he is willing to be tamed by humans. He considers it his duty to accept the culture of other peoples who inhabited that territory and established their order and to serve his master without hesitation. He achieves that goal by using his werewolf qualities to serve people. In this way, it loses its characteristic wildness and freshness. London suggests that wolves are friendly, adaptable animals and that even their predatory nature can be used in the direction of loyal service to humankind.

On the other hand, Akkuratka and Tasshainar in Aitmatov's work were portrayed as actual straight thrones. Although the two wolves suffered, they refused to compromise. Hence, the origins of Aitmatov's fiction can be found in a mythological space, mythopoetics, and folklore, consisting of "ethno-aesthetic microunits, which provide poetic, emotional, philosophical, sociopsychological information about the spiritual and material culture of the people" (Nureeva, et al. 2020, p. 922). Thus, metaphorically speaking, Aitmatov portrays people's yearning for freedom by associating them with the wolf. In other words, Aitmatov tries to convey the national knowledge of the Kazakh people through the wolves who migrated from the Kazakh steppes to the Kyrgyz country due to the environmental problems caused by human beings. In real life, with the establishment of the Soviet government, the way of life of nomadic people, who were free to roam, changed as those who could not bear this hardship quickly moved to the Afghan side. However, the Kazakhs of Turkic origin did not stop their struggle for freedom and independence. Therefore, Aitmatov associates Kazakh people with the wolf, unlike London's wolf, whose existence does not center around issues of freedom and independence.

### References

- Altai, A. (2021). *Peak (Red Wolf)*. Retrieved on June 21, 2022, from <https://www.zharar.com/index.php?do=shorttexts&action=item&id=36909>
- Aitmatov, G. (2005). *Zhanpida*. Almaty: Atamura.
- Arikan, A. (2011). Literary analysis and ecocriticism. *Mediterranean Journal of Humanities*, 1(1), 41–49. <https://doi.org/10.13114/MJH/20111809>

- Gökalp Alpaslan, G. G. (2013). Aitmatov's *The Place of the Skull* (The scaffold): Nature's balance and animal minds. *Journal of Faculty of Letters*, 30(2), 1–18.
- National encyclopedia of Kazakhstan* (Vol. 3). (2003). Almaty: Kazakh Encyclopedia. Kazakh Encyclopedias Limited Liability Partnership.
- National encyclopedia of Kazakhstan* (Vol. 5). (2003). Almaty: Kazakh Encyclopedias Limited Liability Partnership.
- Kanarbayeva, B. (2004). *Reflection of Kazakh beliefs in folklore*. Almaty: Jazuşy.
- Kazakh proverbs and sayings*. (2013). Almaty: Balasy.
- London, J. (1960). *White Fang*. Almaty: Kazakhstan Press.
- Maydangalieva, Z. A., Benkovskaya, T. E., Yatrovskaya, E. R., & Sosnovskaya, I. V. (2018). Literary development of schoolchildren as an important issue of modern educational curriculum. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 9(3), 198–214. <https://doi.org/10.17499/jsser.28708>
- Murtaza, S. (2002). *Al and Aisha* (Vol. 5). Almaty: Kazygurt.
- Pramod, K. N. (2023). Precarious denizens: The dogs of war and conflict. *Journal of Narrative and Language Studies*, 11(21), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.59045/nalans.2023.11>
- Nureeva, G. I., Mingazova, L. I., Rogachev, V. I., & Flera, S. S. (2020). Folklore and mythological motives in the works of Cenghis Aitmatov. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 9, 920–924. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.95>
- Saltanat, O. (2021). The mythological character of the wolf among the Turkic and Slavic peoples. Retrieved from <https://massaget.kz/blogs/26907/>
- Yang, H. (2015). Psychoanalysis of Jack London's *The Call of the Wild* and *White Fang*. *English Language Teaching*, 8(11), 42–46. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n11p42>