



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-678X-2026-156-3-178-189>

IRSTI 17.07.41
Research article

M. Zeinollakizi 

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: merekezeinollakizi@gmail.com)

AUTHOR'S GENDER POSITION AND NARRATION IN THE CREATION OF A FEMALE IMAGE

Abstract. This article presents a comparative analysis of authorial gender and narrative strategies in the literary representation of female figures in G. Musrepov's *Mother of Mothers*, Ch. Aitmatov's *Jamilia*, V. Woolf's *Mrs Dalloway*, and T. Morrison's *Beloved*. The study aims to identify artistic techniques used to construct female subjectivity, inner world, social role, and symbolic function. It employs comparative-typological analysis, close reading, and elements of gender and narratological analysis. The analysis focuses on motherhood, sacrifice, freedom, resistance, historical memory, social constraints, inner voice, and agency. The findings indicate that social, moral, and active dimensions of female characters are more pronounced in the works of the selected male authors, while female authors more extensively integrate consciousness, memory, and psychological experience into narrative structure. These differences are considered in relation to genre, historical context, cultural environment, and individual authorial poetics rather than attributed solely to gender. Reception is understood as a potential interpretive possibility generated by the text rather than an empirical reader response. The study's novelty lies in treating authorial gender as one analytical dimension of comparative literary analysis rather than an isolated causal factor.

Keywords: gender reception, image of woman, author's gender, reader response, Kazakh literature.

Received: 22.06.2026; **Revised:** 31.08.2026; **Accepted:** 21.09.2026; **Available online:** 29.09.2026

Introduction

Contemporary literary scholarship increasingly approaches fiction as more than the direct expression of authorial intention. A literary work is understood as an aesthetic construct whose meaning develops through the interaction of authorial choices, textual organization, and interpretation. Reception aesthetics gives particular attention to this dynamic process. Wolfgang Iser emphasizes the reader's role in completing textual "gaps," while Hans Robert Jauss situates interpretation within the historically conditioned "horizon of expectations" (Iser, 1978; Jauss, 1982). The meaning of a literary image is not predetermined or stable. It is produced through the narrative, compositional, and stylistic features that shape the reader's engagement with the text.

Gender criticism offers a useful theoretical basis for this comparative analysis. Within this framework, gender is understood not simply as biological difference. But as a social and cultural construct shaped by established roles, norms, repeated practices, and relations of power. Simone de Beauvoir situates women's social position within historically formed structures, emphasizing that female identity is produced through social and cultural conditions rather than determined by biology alone (Beauvoir, 2011). Elaine Showalter established women's writing as a distinct field of inquiry (Showalter, 1977). Judith Butler later described gender as a performative formation. It is reproduced through social acts and discourse (Butler, 1990). These approaches support a comparative study of authorship. They also clarify links between gender and representation.

The present study compares four literary works. They are G. Musrepov's short story *Mother of Mothers*, Ch. Aitmatov's novella *Jamilia*, Virginia Woolf's *Mrs Dalloway*, and Toni Morrison's *Beloved*. These texts do not represent entire national traditions. They are treated as four comparative literary cases. Their cultural settings and historical conditions are different. That difference is methodologically important. The study therefore does not compare Kazakh, Kyrgyz, British, and African American literatures as complete systems. Instead, it compares how selected authors construct female subjectivity.

Musrepov's *Mother of Mothers* presents female identity through moral strength. Maternal responsibility and ethical resistance are central (Musrepov, 2012). The mother becomes more than an individual figure. She embodies the value of human life. Her authority grows through speech and action. Her inner life is not developed through long monologues. It appears through choice, conduct, and moral position. Female subjectivity is thus externalized through ethical action.

Aitmatov's *Jamilia* develops another model of female agency. The character lives within a traditional social order. Yet she does not simply accept its expectations. Her choices foreground love, freedom, and self-determination (Aitmatov, 2007). *Jamilia* assumes responsibility for her own decision. Her image is also mediated through another character's perception. This creates a productive narrative tension. She is observed from outside, yet remains self-directed.

Woolf's *Mrs Dalloway* shifts the emphasis inward. Clarissa Dalloway's social role remains highly visible. Her inner consciousness is equally important, however. Modernist narration connects memory, time, and reflection (Woolf, 1925/2000). Her public identity does not exhaust her character. Private thought repeatedly unsettles social appearances. Interior consciousness therefore becomes a major structural principle.

Morrison's *Beloved* places female subjectivity within historical trauma. Sethe's experience is shaped by slavery and memory. Motherhood and responsibility remain inseparable from

violence (Morrison, 1987). Her actions resist simple moral classification. Fragmented memory structures much of her experience. Nonlinear time also shapes the narrative. Multiple voices further complicate a single perspective. Psychological experience thus enters the architecture of the novel.

Comparison of these works reveals recurring differences in emphasis. In Musrepov and Aitmatov, action and moral choice remain prominent. Social relations also shape the female character strongly. In Woolf and Morrison, interiority becomes more structurally central. Memory and psychological experience enter the narrative more deeply. These patterns are not treated as universal gender differences. They belong to this selected corpus.

Authorial gender is therefore not used as an isolated cause. The four works differ in period and genre. They also differ in culture and literary tradition. Any interpretation must account for those differences. Gender is treated as one analytical dimension among others. Historical context and individual poetics remain equally important. The study does not propose a universal theory of “male writing” or “female writing.”

The study aims to compare narrative, psychological, symbolic, and stylistic strategies. It examines how these strategies construct female characters. It also asks how authorial gender intersects with them. Two questions guide the analysis. What similarities and differences appear across the four texts? How should those differences be interpreted within each context?

Reception aesthetics shifted attention from authorial intention alone. It emphasized the reader’s role in meaning-making. Wolfgang Iser placed text–reader interaction at the center. Readers complete textual “gaps” through prior knowledge. Cultural experience also shapes this interpretive process (Iser, 1978). Hans Robert Jauss developed a related historical perspective. His “horizon of expectations” links reception with context. Aesthetic norms influence how works are understood. Moral values and social expectations also matter (Jauss, 1982). In this study, these theories have limited use. They do not prove actual reader responses. Instead, they explain interpretive possibilities created by texts.

Gender criticism extends this textual and receptive framework. Simone de Beauvoir viewed female subjectivity as socially formed. Historical and cultural structures shape women’s positions (Beauvoir, 2011). Elaine Showalter reconsidered women’s writing within literary history. She also challenged women’s exclusion from established canons (Showalter, 1977). Judith Butler later questioned fixed models of gender. She described gender as performative and socially repeated. Discourse and social practice continually reproduce it (Butler, 1990). These approaches discourage simple biological explanations of authorship. They suggest a more complex relation instead. Authorial gender interacts with culture and literary form. It can therefore inform analysis without determining it.

Recent studies also examine gender in literary circulation. Kim and Chong studied English-language fiction and reviews. Their research used a large textual corpus. They identified persistent gender inequality in literary evaluation. Female authors faced uneven patterns of critical attention (Kim & Chong, 2023). This evidence is important for literary reception studies. However, it concerns institutional and critical responses. It does not explain narrative form directly. The present article therefore takes another approach. It focuses on the poetics of literary texts. Particular attention is given to female characterization.

Studies of women in Kazakh literature provide context. They often connect female representation with social change. National values and gender stereotypes are also examined. E. Adayeva (2023) relates female images to historical transformation. Her work also considers

Kazakh cultural traditions. This perspective is relevant to Musrepov's *Mother of Mothers*. The story can be read through national ethics. Humanistic values also shape the mother figure. Yet the present study adds another dimension. The mother is treated as an acting subject. Her speech establishes authority within the narrative. Her resistance also defines her moral position. Thus, the character exceeds symbolic motherhood alone.

Research by Madibaeva and Toleu addresses female identity in Sara Mynzhasarova's *Women's Happiness*. Their analysis considers women's equality and national identity. It also discusses Soviet-era feminist contexts. Such studies demonstrate the value of gender analysis. They connect female characters with changing social structures. Another domestic study links gender with literary reception. It argues that interpretation reflects social experience. Cultural and gendered experience also affects reading (Zeinollakizi, 2026). These studies broaden the field considerably. Yet they do not fully address comparative authorship. They rarely compare male and female narrative strategies.

Koolen, van Dalen-Oskam, van Cranenburgh, and Nagelhout examine another dimension. They study judgments of literary quality and value. Such judgments do not depend on texts alone. Readers also bring expectations about genre and authorship. Social experience may influence their evaluations as well (Koolen et al., 2020). Their findings support a multifactorial view of reception. They also caution against simple interpretive models. Still, their evidence concerns actual reader judgments. The present study does not measure such responses. Their work therefore provides theoretical context only. It cannot establish gendered responses to these characters.

Existing scholarship reveals two main research tendencies. One examines female representation within national traditions. Another studies gender in reception and evaluation. Both approaches have produced valuable findings. Yet a comparative gap remains visible. Less attention has been given to narrative construction. Male and female authors are rarely compared systematically. This is especially true across cultural contexts. The same analytical criteria are seldom applied throughout. Therefore, female subjectivity is difficult to compare directly.

The present study addresses this specific gap. It examines four selected literary works comparatively. These are Musrepov's *Mother of Mothers*, Aitmatov's *Jamila*, Woolf's *Mrs Dalloway*, and Morrison's *Beloved*. The texts are not treated statistically. They do not represent entire national traditions. Instead, each work functions as a literary case. The comparison uses shared analytical categories. These include subjectivity, agency, voice, and focalization. Historical context remains important throughout the analysis.

Authorial gender is treated as one analytical variable rather than as a determining factor. Its significance is considered alongside genre, historical period, cultural context, and individual poetics. This framework avoids reductive gender stereotypes and broad claims about male or female writing as fixed categories. The analysis instead remains grounded in textual evidence, focusing on how female characters are represented, positioned within the narrative, and assigned psychological and symbolic functions. Gender retains analytical value without being isolated from the wider literary and cultural conditions that shape each work.

Research Methods

The research corpus includes four literary works. These are G. Musrepov's *Mother of Mothers*, Ch. Aitmatov's *Jamila*, Virginia Woolf's *Mrs Dalloway*, and Toni Morrison's *Beloved*

(Musrepov, 2012; Aitmatov, 2007; Woolf, 1925/2000; Morrison, 1987). The corpus was formed through purposive comparative sampling. Musrepov and Aitmatov represent male authorship. Woolf and Morrison represent female authorship. The works are not treated as national prototypes. Instead, they function as four literary case studies. This design allows cross-contextual comparison of female representation. Authorial gender is not treated as causal. It is used as one comparative dimension. Cultural context, genre, and individual poetics remain important.

The primary method is comparative-typological analysis. It is supported by close reading. Elements of gender-oriented narratology are also applied. The same analytical criteria were used throughout. These include narrative function, subjectivity, and agency. Attention was also given to inner voice. Focalization and social positioning were examined as well. The analysis further considered freedom, dependence, motherhood, sacrifice, resistance, and historical memory. Links with national and social values were included.

The analysis was conducted in three stages. First, each text was examined separately. Narrative, psychological, symbolic, and stylistic strategies were identified. Second, shared and contrasting features were compared. Third, recurring patterns were interpreted comparatively. This interpretation considered gender, poetics, and historical context. Analytical consistency was maintained through shared criteria. Each conclusion was linked to textual evidence.

Reception is understood in a limited sense. It does not refer to empirical reader responses. Instead, it denotes potential or implicit reception. This possibility is generated by textual structure. Therefore, the findings are not generalized broadly. They apply only to the selected corpus.

Results and Discussion

The comparative analysis revealed both shared patterns and clear differences. These differences concern narrative form and stylistic organization. The same criteria were applied to all four texts. They included narrative function, subjectivity, agency, focalization, and social position. The analysis also considered motherhood, resistance, historical memory, and symbolic function. Across the corpus, female characters are not secondary figures. Each character contributes directly to the text's ideological structure. Their subjectivity is expressed through different narrative mechanisms.

In G. Musrepov's *Mother of Mothers*, female representation centers on moral authority. Maternal responsibility also shapes the character's position. Resistance becomes another defining feature of her agency (Musrepov, 2012). The mother exceeds a purely domestic role. She embodies human dignity, endurance, and protection. Her subjectivity appears mainly through speech and action. Musrepov does not rely on extended interior monologue. Instead, he reveals character through decisions and conduct. Her moral position becomes especially visible under pressure. This method connects psychological meaning with outward action.

The mother's symbolic role also extends beyond private experience. Motherhood does not function as a sign of weakness. It becomes the basis of moral strength. Maternal feeling and resistance therefore develop together. Her voice is especially important in this process. Speech gives the character authority within the narrative. It also defines her as an acting subject. The story thus links motherhood with ethical agency. This combination shapes the female figure's central artistic function.

A different model appears in Ch. Aitmatov's *Jamilia*. Jamilia lives within a traditional social environment. Yet her role is not limited by convention. Her central quality is the ability to choose.

She accepts responsibility for her emotional decision (Aitmatov, 2007). Female subjectivity therefore emerges through personal freedom. It is also expressed through self-determination. Motherhood is not the main organizing category here. The conflict centers instead on individual choice.

Jamalia is presented through another character's perception. This narrative mediation shapes her representation. She becomes an object of external observation. At the same time, she remains an autonomous subject. Her consciousness is not explored like Clarissa's. Yet her actions disclose a clear inner position. Her agency is therefore expressed behaviorally. It appears in a choice that challenges social expectations. This gives the character a distinct narrative independence.

Virginia Woolf's *Mrs Dalloway* uses another strategy. Female subjectivity is organized through interior consciousness. Clarissa Dalloway's social identity remains visible throughout. Yet her inner life receives equal narrative weight (Woolf, 1925/2000). Daily actions merge with memory and reflection. Subjective time also shapes her experience. Past relationships return through thought. Earlier decisions are repeatedly reassessed. These movements make consciousness structurally important.

Shifts in focalization deepen this internal perspective. Interior monologue expands Clarissa's psychological presence. She is not defined only by social appearance. Her inner experience becomes part of narrative form. The text repeatedly contrasts public identity with private thought. This tension structures the character's representation. Social stability therefore coexists with internal uncertainty. The result is a layered model of female subjectivity. It depends less on outward action than on mental movement.

In Toni Morrison's *Beloved*, female subjectivity develops through historical trauma. Motherhood is central, but it is not idealized. Sethe's experience is shaped by slavery and memory. Violence also frames her choices and responsibilities (Morrison, 1987). Her actions resist a single moral judgment. They emerge from extreme historical conditions. The character's psychological world is therefore inseparable from history.

Morrison uses fragmented memory to organize this experience. Nonlinear time also shapes the narrative. Different voices interrupt a single perspective. As a result, the past never remains fully past. It continues to affect the present. Historical violence becomes a continuing psychological reality. Sethe's agency therefore exceeds personal freedom alone. It concerns survival, family, and human dignity. Her subjectivity develops through memory and trauma. These elements structure both character and narrative.

Comparison across the four works reveals distinct forms of agency. In *Mother of Mothers*, agency appears through speech and resistance. It is grounded in moral responsibility. In *Jamalia*, it develops through personal choice. The character acts against expected social roles. In *Mrs Dalloway*, subjectivity is primarily internalized. Reflection and subjective time organize the female perspective. In *Beloved*, memory and trauma shape agency. Historical violence enters the character's inner world.

The two male-authored texts foreground action more clearly. Social relations and moral choice are also prominent. The two female-authored novels give greater structural space to interiority. Memory and psychological experience become narrative principles. This pattern remains limited to the selected corpus. It does not form a strict binary. *Jamalia's* independence has a strong subjective dimension. Woolf and Morrison also emphasize social pressure. Historical conditions remain equally important in Morrison's novel.

The comparison therefore identifies differences of emphasis rather than fixed gender traits. Authorial gender does not explain the findings alone. Narrative form, genre, and historical setting also matter. Individual poetics remain especially significant. The four texts construct female subjectivity through different combinations of action and voice. They also vary in their use of memory and focalization.

From a receptive perspective, none of these texts fixes one interpretation. *Mother of Mothers* combines maternal symbolism with resistance. *Jamilia* links freedom with social transgression. *Mrs Dalloway* complicates public identity through inner consciousness. *Beloved* connects motherhood with historical trauma. These structures permit several interpretive positions. The comparison therefore shows a complex pattern. Female representation emerges through gendered authorship and narrative form. It also depends on genre and historical experience. Within this corpus, no single factor determines the female image.

The findings suggest that authorial gender requires careful interpretation. It should not function as a single causal explanation. Literary representation emerges from several interacting conditions. Textual poetics is one of these conditions. Historical context and genre are equally important. Individual artistic practice also shapes female representation. This approach avoids biological explanations of literary difference. It also prevents gender from becoming deterministic.

Major theories of gender support this methodological position. Simone de Beauvoir rejects an essentialist model of femininity. Female identity develops within social and historical relations (Beauvoir, 2011). Judith Butler develops this argument further. She defines gender through repeated cultural practices. Gender is produced through discourse and social performance (Butler, 1990). These approaches challenge simple links between sex and writing. An author's gender cannot predict a literary technique. Nor can it determine a character's representation. It remains relevant only within broader textual relations.

Elaine Showalter provides another useful perspective. She established women's writing as a distinct research field (Showalter, 1977). Her work encouraged scholars to examine female experience closely. It also challenged the exclusion of women writers. Yet women's authorship does not imply stylistic uniformity. Virginia Woolf and Toni Morrison demonstrate this clearly. They belong to different historical and literary contexts. Their narrative practices also differ considerably. The same principle applies to male authorship. Musrepov and Aitmatov use different representational strategies. Authorial gender therefore remains a comparative category. It cannot replace individual poetics or cultural context.

This distinction is essential for the corpus design. *Mother of Mothers*, *Jamilia*, *Mrs Dalloway*, and *Beloved* belong to different traditions. They were also produced in different periods. Their genres and literary environments are not identical. The four texts therefore cannot represent entire literatures. They should not stand for all male writers. They cannot represent all female writers either. Each work instead functions as a literary case. The comparison concerns shared analytical dimensions across cases. This framework permits comparison without claiming representativeness.

The inclusion of Musrepov deserves particular attention. *Mother of Mothers* allows motherhood to be reconsidered. The figure carries clear national and ethical associations. However, its meaning is not purely symbolic. The mother also possesses narrative agency. Her speech gives her authority within the story. Her decisions reveal an active moral position. Resistance becomes part of her literary identity. This interpretation extends beyond

conventional maternal symbolism. It does not reject the national-cultural reading. Rather, it adds a gendered dimension to it.

This point matters for studies of Kazakh literature. Female figures are often discussed through cultural values. National identity and social change receive strong attention. Gender stereotypes also form a common research focus. Such approaches remain important for contextual interpretation. Yet they can sometimes privilege symbolic function. Female subjectivity may then receive less attention. The present comparison addresses this issue differently. It considers symbolic meaning alongside narrative agency. It also examines how voice creates literary authority. This combination broadens the analysis of female representation.

Reception aesthetics further clarifies the study's position. Iser argues that literary meaning remains partly open. Readers complete textual gaps during interpretation (Iser, 1978). Jauss places this process within historical expectations. Reception changes with aesthetic and social conventions (Jauss, 1982). These theories support interpretive plurality. They explain why literary characters resist fixed meaning. However, they do not establish empirical reader behavior. This distinction is methodologically important here.

The present study contains no reader survey. It also includes no interviews or focus groups. Reader reviews were not collected as data. Claims about actual male readers are therefore inappropriate. The same applies to actual female readers. Reception is used in a narrower sense. It describes interpretive possibilities produced by textual form. Such possibilities emerge through narration and focalization. They also emerge through memory and symbolic structure. This use remains compatible with reception aesthetics. It avoids unsupported claims about social groups.

This position differs from empirical reception research. Kim and Chong examine gender within literary evaluation. Their study addresses publishing and critical reception. It also considers inequalities affecting women authors (Kim & Chong, 2023). Their evidence comes from large-scale textual data. Koolen and colleagues address another reception problem. They examine judgments of literary quality. Reader expectations and social experience influence such judgments (Koolen et al., 2020). These studies show that reception is multifactorial. They also demonstrate the value of empirical evidence.

However, those findings serve a limited purpose here. They provide a broader theoretical context. They do not prove how these characters are read. They cannot demonstrate differences between male and female readers. The present article therefore remains text-centered. Its conclusions concern narrative possibilities, not measured responses. This distinction strengthens the study's methodological boundaries.

The comparative framework also clarifies authorial gender itself. Gender may shape artistic emphasis in some cases. Yet that relation is never isolated. Historical period can alter literary conventions significantly. Genre can change available narrative techniques. Cultural discourse can shape character construction. Individual poetics may override broader tendencies. For this reason, gender should remain relational. It works alongside other interpretive variables.

The study's contribution lies in this non-binary approach. It avoids a fixed opposition between male writing and female writing. Instead, it examines patterns within a limited corpus. Those patterns are treated as textual tendencies. They are not presented as universal gender traits. This distinction preserves the value of comparison. At the same time, it limits overgeneralization.

The corpus also defines the study's main limitation. Four texts cannot isolate gender statistically. Cultural and historical variables remain intertwined. The study also lacks

empirical reception data. These limits define the scope of interpretation. They do not invalidate comparative analysis. Future research could expand the corpus carefully. Texts could be matched by period or genre. Cultural proximity could also be increased. Empirical reception could then form a second stage. Surveys or reader reviews would be useful. Such evidence could test textual interpretations directly. It would also distinguish textual possibility from actual reception.

Conclusion

The analysis focused on authorial gender, narrative strategy, and individual poetics. The findings show that female characters cannot be reduced to thematic roles. Their literary meaning develops through narrative form and focalization. Inner voice and agency are also important. Social position, historical memory, and cultural context further shape their representation.

The comparative analysis identified both shared and distinct strategies. In Musrepov's *Mother of Mothers*, the female figure is defined through moral authority. Maternal responsibility and resistance are also central. In Aitmatov's *Jamila*, female subjectivity emerges through personal choice. Love and independence challenge established social expectations. In Woolf's *Mrs Dalloway*, interior consciousness becomes structurally important. Subjective time and psychological reflection shape the character's presence. In Morrison's *Beloved*, female identity is linked to motherhood, slavery, trauma, and memory. Personal responsibility is therefore inseparable from historical violence.

Within the selected corpus, the two male-authored texts foreground action more clearly. Social relations and moral choice receive greater emphasis. The two female-authored novels give broader narrative space to interiority. Memory and psychological experience also become more prominent. These differences should not be treated as universal. They do not define all male or female writing. Authorial gender is only one analytical dimension. Genre, historical period, cultural setting, and individual poetics remain equally important.

Reception was used in a limited sense. It does not refer to measured responses from actual readers. Instead, it describes interpretive possibilities created by textual structure. The study therefore makes no empirical claims about differences between male and female readers.

The comparison shows that authorial gender is most useful when treated relationally. It should not be used as a direct causal explanation. Future research could expand the corpus by matching texts more closely by period, genre, or cultural setting. Empirical reception studies could then be added. Surveys, interviews, focus groups, and reader-review analysis would help compare textual possibilities with actual reader responses.

Conflict of interests

The author declares no conflict of interest

AI statement

Artificial intelligence tools (Grammarly and DeepL) were used only for checking and improving the grammar, clarity, and style of the English language in this article. The research idea, analysis, interpretation of sources, conclusions, and final scholarly content were developed by the author.

References

- Адаева, Е. С. (2023). Қазақ әдебиетін зерттеудің гендерлік аспектілері. Еуразия гуманитарлық институтының хабаршысы, (3), 85–101. <https://doi.org/10.55808/1999-4214.2023-3.06>
- Aitmatov, C. (2007). Jamilia (J. Riordan, Trans.). Telegram Books.
- Beauvoir, S. de. (2011). The second sex (C. Borde & S. Malovany-Chevallier, Trans.). Vintage Books.
- Butler, J. (1990). Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity. Routledge.
- Iser, W. (1978). The act of reading: A theory of aesthetic response. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jauss, H. R. (1982). Toward an aesthetic of reception (T. Bahti, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
- Kim, K. W., & Chong, P. K. (2023). Writing by women or for women? Either way, you're less likely to be reviewed. Poetics, 96, Article 101737. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2022.101737>
- Koolen, C., van Dalen-Oskam, K., van Cranenburgh, A., & Nagelhout, E. (2020). Literary quality in the eye of the Dutch reader: The National Reader Survey. Poetics, 79, Article 101439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2020.101439>
- Мәдібаева, Қ. Қ., & Төлеу, А. Б. (2025). Сара Мыңжасарованың «Әйел бақыты» романындағы әйел образдарының гендерлік бірегейлігі. Keruen, 87(2), 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.53871/2078-8134.2025.2-01>
- Morrison, T. (1987). Beloved. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Мүсірепов, Ғ. (2012). Таңдамалы шығармалары (Ә. Қайырбеков, құраст.). ҚАЗАҚПАРАТ.
- Showalter, E. (1977). A literature of their own: British women novelists from Brontë to Lessing. Princeton University Press.
- Woolf, V. (2000). Mrs Dalloway. Penguin Books. (Original work published 1925)
- Zeinollakizi, M. (2026). Invisible authors, visible gender: How readers infer author gender from fiction. Open Cultural Studies, 10(1), Article 20250103. <https://doi.org/10.1515/culture-2025-0103>

М. Зейноллақызы

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Әйел бейнесін жасаудағы автордың гендерлік тұрғысы және нарративтілік

Аңдатпа. Мақалада ер және әйел авторлардың әйел кейіпкерлерін көркем бейнелеу ерекшеліктері мен баяндау стратегиялары салыстырмалы тұрғыдан талданады. Зерттеу материалы ретінде Ғ. Мүсіреповтің «Аналар анасы» әңгімесі, Ш. Айтматовтың «Жәмила» повесі, В. Вулфтың «Даллоуэй ханым» романы және Т. Моррисонның «Сүйікті» романы алынды. Зерттеудің мақсаты – таңдалған ер және әйел авторлардың шығармаларындағы әйел кейіпкерлерінің субъектілігін, ішкі әлемін, әлеуметтік рөлін және символдық қызметін ашуда қолданылатын көркемдік тәсілдерді анықтау. Зерттеу барысында салыстырмалы-типологиялық әдіс, мәтінді егжей-тегжейлі талдау, сондай-ақ гендерлік және нарратологиялық талдау элементтері қолданылды. Талдау ана бейнесі, өзін-өзі құрбан ету, еркіндік, қарсылық, тарихи жад, әлеуметтік шектеулер, ішкі дауыс және субъектілік белсенділік сияқты ортақ категориялар негізінде жүргізілді. Зерттеу нәтижелері ер авторлардың шығармаларында әйел кейіпкерлерінің әлеуметтік, моральдық және әрекеттік қырлары айқынырақ көрінетінін, ал әйел авторлардың шығармаларында ішкі сана, жад және психологиялық тәжірибе баяндау құрылымымен тереңірек сабақтасатынын көрсетті. Алайда бұл айырмашылықтар тек автордың жынысына байланысты қарастырылмаған. Шығармалар жанрлық ерекшеліктермен, тарихи контекспен, мәдени ортамен және жазушының жеке поэтикасымен өзара байланыста талданады. Мәтінді қабылдау мақалада нақты оқырмандардың эмпирикалық реакциясы ретінде емес, көркем мәтіннің интерпретациялық әлеуеті ретінде түсіндіріледі. Зерттеудің

ғылыми жаңалығы автордың жынысын дербес себептік фактор ретінде емес, салыстырмалы әдеби талдаудың өзара байланысты өлшемдерінің бірі ретінде қарастырумен айқындалады.

Түйін сөздер: гендерлік рецепция, әйел бейнесі, автор гендері, оқырман қабылдауы, қазақ әдебиеті

М. Зейноллақызы

Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан

Гендерная позиция автора и нарратив в создании женского образа

Аннотация. В статье представлен сравнительный анализ гендерной принадлежности автора и нарративных стратегий при литературном изображении женских образов. Для анализа выбраны рассказ Г. Мусрепова «Мать матерей», повесть Ч. Айтматова «Джамиля», роман В. Вулф «Миссис Дэллоуэй» и роман Т. Моррисон «Возлюбленная». Цель статьи - выявить художественные приемы, используемые для конструирования субъектности, внутреннего мира, социальной роли и символической функции женского персонажа в произведениях выбранных авторов-мужчин и авторов-женщин. В работе применяются сравнительно-типологический анализ, метод детального анализа текста, а также элементы гендерного и нарратологического анализа. Анализ проводится с опорой на такие общие категории, как материнство, самопожертвование, свобода, сопротивление, историческая память, социальные ограничения, внутренний голос и субъектная активность. Результаты показывают, что, хотя социальные, нравственные и деятельностные аспекты женских образов более выражены в текстах авторов-мужчин, произведения авторов-женщин в большей степени интегрируют в структуру повествования внутреннее сознание, память и психологический опыт. Однако эти различия не сводятся исключительно к гендеру автора, они рассматриваются в совокупности с жанром, историческим контекстом, культурной средой и индивидуальной поэтикой писателя. Рецепция понимается здесь не как эмпирическая реакция реальных читателей, а как потенциальная возможность интерпретации, заложенная в самом тексте. Научная новизна исследования заключается в том, что гендерная принадлежность автора рассматривается не как изолированный причинный фактор, а как одно из измерений сравнительного литературоведческого анализа.

Ключевые слова: гендерное восприятие, образ женщины, гендер автора, восприятие читателя, казахская литература

References

Adayeva, Y. S. (2023). Qazaq adebietin zertteudin genderlik aspektleri [Gender aspects of studying Kazakh literature]. Bulletin of the Eurasian Humanities Institute, (3), 85–101. <https://doi.org/10.55808/1999-4214.2023-3.06>

Aitmatov, C. (2007). Jamilia (J. Riordan, Trans.). Telegram Books.

Beauvoir, S. de. (2011). The second sex (C. Borde & S. Malovany-Chevallier, Trans.). Vintage Books.

Butler, J. (1990). Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity. Routledge.

Iser, W. (1978). The act of reading: A theory of aesthetic response. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Jauss, H. R. (1982). Toward an aesthetic of reception (T. Bahti, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.

Kim, K. W., & Chong, P. K. (2023). Writing by women or for women? Either way, you're less likely to be reviewed. Poetics, 96, Article 101737. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2022.101737>

Koolen, C., van Dalen-Oskam, K., van Cranenburgh, A., & Nagelhout, E. (2020). Literary quality in the eye of the Dutch reader: The National Reader Survey. Poetics, 79, Article 101439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2020.101439>

Madibayeva, K. K., & Toleu, A. B. (2025). Sara Mynzhasarovany "Aiel baqyty" romanyndagy aiel obrazdarynyn genderlik biregeiligi [The gender identity of female characters in Sara Mynzhasarova's novel Female happiness]. Keruen, 87(2), 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.53871/2078-8134.2025.2-01>

-
- Morrison, T. (1987). *Beloved*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Musrepov, G. (2012). *Tandamaly shygarmalary* [Selected works] (A. Qaiyrbekov, Comp.). QAZaqqarat.
- Showalter, E. (1977). *A literature of their own: British women novelists from Brontë to Lessing*. Princeton University Press.
- Woolf, V. (2000). *Mrs Dalloway*. Penguin Books. (Original work published 1925)
- Zeinollakizi, M. (2026). Invisible authors, visible gender: How readers infer author gender from fiction. *Open Cultural Studies*, 10(1), Article 20250103. <https://doi.org/10.1515/culture-2025-0103>

Information about the author

Zeinollakizi Mereke – PhD candidate, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, Email: merekezeinollakizi@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1773-0500>, Scopus ID: 60661064800

Зейноллақызы Мереке – PhD кандидат, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, Email: merekezeinollakizi@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1773-0500>, Scopus ID: 60661064800

Зейноллақызы Мереке – PhD кандидат, Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан, Email: merekezeinollakizi@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1773-0500>, Scopus ID: 60661064800



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).