



*Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi Sayı: 12/3 2023 s. 894-907, TÜRKİYE*

*Research Article*

**A NEW PERSPECTIVE TO THE DEDE KORKUT STORIES WITHIN THE  
FRAMEWORK OF HABITUS, CAPITAL AND FIELD CONCEPTS OF PIERRE  
BOURDIEU**

**Sahra İpek EDİS AYDOĐAN\***

*Geliş Tarihi: 27.02.2023*

*Kabul Tarihi: 22.05.2023*

**Abstract**

Pierre Bourdieu, one of the leading thinkers of the 20th century, introduced not only new concepts to the social sciences, field but also expanded the scope of existing concepts. Bourdieu brought a critical perspective to the dualities between concepts, based on the assumption that the explanatory power of each concept and theory can change according to the phenomenon and event being studied. Bourdieu's concepts of field, habitus and capital try to make sense of the factors that trigger the action itself in social sciences by establishing two-way, reflexive circular relations between cause and effect.

In this study, the concepts such as field, habitus and capital, which Bourdieu developed with an intervention based understanding of the dualities in the social sciences; It aims to reveal that it is effective in making sense and interpreting literary texts. The study also opens the door to new literary studies to be made with these concepts of Bourdieu.

**Keywords:** Field, Dede Korkut Stories, habitus, Pierre Bourdieu, capital.

**PIERRE BOURDIEU'NÜN HABİTUS, SERMAYE VE ALAN  
KAVRAMLARI ÇERÇEVESİNDE DEDE KORKUT  
HİKÂYELERİ'NE YENİ BİR BAKIŞ**

**Öz**

20. yüzyılın önde gelen düşünürlerinden biri olan Pierre Bourdieu, sosyal bilimlerin alanına yeni kavramlar kazandırmasının yanında mevcut kavramların kapsamını da genişletmiştir. Bourdieu, her kavram ve kuramın incelenen olgu ve olaya göre açıklayıcılığının değişebileceği varsayımından yola çıkarak kavramlar arasındaki ikiliklere eleştirel bir bakış açısı getirmiştir. Bourdieu'nun alan, habitus ve sermaye kavramları neden ve sonuç arasında iki yönlü, dönüşlü dairesel ilişkiler kurarak sosyal bilimlerde eylemin kendisini tetikleyen etmenleri anlamlandırmaya çalışır.

Bu çalışmada, Bourdieu'nun sosyal bilimlerin alanındaki ikiliklere müdahaleye dayalı anlayışıyla geliştirdiği alan, habitus ve sermaye gibi kavramların edebî metinleri anlamlandırmada ve yorumlamada etkili olduğunu ortaya koymak amaçlanmaktadır. Çalışma, Bourdieu'nun bu kavramlarıyla yapılacak yeni edebî incelemelere de kapı aralamaktadır.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Alan, Dede Korkut Hikâyeleri, habitus, Pierre Bourdieu, sermaye.

\* Öğr. Gör. Dr.; Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi Kurumsal İletişim Koordinatörlüğü, [sahra.aydogan@kilis.edu.tr](mailto:sahra.aydogan@kilis.edu.tr).

## Introduction

Self-recognition and self-definition bids of humans in both individual and social terms begin once they come into existence. Humans, embodying to transfer themselves to the future besides making sense of the in world, tend to sustain their lives as social beings. Therefore, human-focused studies focus on forming their theories through individual and social approaches in an intertwined and complex manner. Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002), who is aware that human is not an individual or social being alone, uses multiple methods to unravel the reasons behind human behaviors in social space and approaches the social-borne events holistically. According to him, social space “is an abstract representation produced at the expense of a specific construction work, like a map, gives a bird’s-eye view (as its schematic presentation suffices to recall itself) and even a point of view on all points (in sociologist or his reader’s behaviors) that ordinary agents ground their views on about the social world” (Bourdieu, 2015, p. 253). In this case, social space subsumes a point of view that holistically addresses the life patterns of individuals and societies.

Bourdieu approves none of the dualist approaches, as he tries to overcome the dualities that arise in understanding the social field and practices. 1During the period when Bourdieu carried out academic studies, there were two currents in France. The first of these currents is Claude Lévi Strauss’s structuralism and the other one is Jean-Paul Sartre’s existentialism (May, 1996, p. 121). According to Bourdieu, human behavior depends on both external reasons predicted by structuralism and internal/cognitive reasons predicted by existentialist notions (Swartz, 2002, p. 61).

Bourdieu notes that Saussure’s structural linguistics approach and its practitioners make methodological errors (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2010, p. 12-14). This hermeneutic method describes the cultural products produced in the historical process as singular products of history, ignoring the cultural and economic conditions of the time, and at the same time, it only performs an internal reading on these cultural products (Bourdieu, 1995, p. 56-59).

In this studies, Bourdieu focuses on everyday practices of individuals rather than individual behaviors, namely social and objective spaces or the institutional or public spaces where these common practices operate. Bourdieu grounds his idea of objectivity on the general structure or field. Bourdieu treats the field of study holistically, not on an individual level, but the basis of the concept of objective structure, and directs his attention to established common practices. This indicates that Bourdieu had developed an attitude towards making sense of social classes. In his work, *Distinction*, he focuses on unraveling the cultural mechanisms of class domination by combining class and cultural analyses.

Bourdieu emphasizes that dualist attitudes such as subject-object, consciousness-body, immanent-transcendent, internal-external, and abstract-concrete should be abandoned and the subject under consideration should be approached holistically from both perspectives. In this context, approaches such as hermeneutic and existential philosophies aiming at deciphering literary works of art only through internal reading are faulty research methods according to Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 2006, p. 9-16). Bourdieu carries out the theory and practice together, as he does not want to examine the action unilaterally. Bourdieu, who synthesizes the views of sociologists, linguists, and phenomenologists like Karl Marx, Marcel Mauss, Max Weber, Émile Durkheim, Ernst Cassirer, Gaston Bachelard, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Ferdinand de Saussure,

Noam Chomsky, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Alfred Schutz, shapes his theories using the data he obtains from the theoretical resources. This way, he created “an original conceptual arsenal”, invigorated with the concepts of habitus, capital, field, and doxa<sup>3</sup> by synthesizing objectivism, subjectivism, social physics, social phenomenology, and linguistics with each other (Wacquant, 2007, p. 267).

### 1. Habitus

Different philosophers and sociologists have also pondered upon the concept of habitus before Bourdieu, a concept that has created a reference in this context. Instead of the concept of habitus, Aristotle uses the concept of *hexis*, meaning temperament, ownership, acquisition, and ability (Tatlıcan & Çeğin 2010, p. 305-306). The concepts of habitus and hexis are basically known as the ability of the individual, a social being, to act within the social structure. While individuals directly position themselves within the objective structures in social spaces, habitus enables continuing their existence and reproducing themselves. Lizardo discusses habitus as follows;

Habitus constantly reproduces itself in an interaction dominated by social rules. The product of the dialectical relationship between a situation and habitus that integrates all past experiences (the transposable disposition and lasting system must be understood) always functions as a matrix of ‘perceptions’, ‘appreciations’, and ‘actions’ (2004, p. 316).

Habitus is a concept used for a series of acquired thought, behavior, and appreciation patterns that form the link between social structures and social practices, offering a basis that can provide a cultural approach to structural inequalities and allowing to focus on activism (Marshall, 1999, p. 291). Bourdieu states that the constituent structures of a given environment produce habitus, durable structures, transposable layouts, and pre-arranged structured structures that function in the form of structuring arrangements. Habitus is a principle that offers solutions to help individuals get out of the deadlocks they have confronted because of obligations, by considering their place in the social structure, namely their place in the hierarchy, their gender, and their position in the family in terms of their birth order (Bourdieu, 2002, p. 558). Also, in Dede Korkut Stories, the status of individuals within the social structure is determined depending on certain norms and rules. The *black tent* appears as a value judgment in the Boğaç Khan Son of Dirse Khan Story, one of the stories of Dede Korkut. Bayındır Khan hosts the Oghuz lords by organizing a feast. Of Oghuz lords, those with sons are placed in white tents, those with daughters, are placed in red tents, and those with no sons or daughters are placed in black tents. Black sheep stew is served to those invited to the black tent. If they do not like the treat, they are asked to leave (Gökyay, 1973, p. 4). According to the narrative, Bayındır Khan marginalizes them because Allah curses those who do not have children. Among the ancient Turks, black tents belong to black bones that make up the prisoner class, white tents to white bones, and red tents to golden bones, that is, to tigers who hold power (Ziya Gökalp, 1976, p. 156). Since Dirse Khan had no son or daughter until that day, they placed him in the black tent thinking that his generation would not continue. Dirse Khan conveys his sadness to his wife about being put in the black tent. And his wife tells him things they need to do to have a child. Accordingly, of horses, a stallion, of camels, a male, and of sheep, a ram will be sacrificed, and the Inner Oghuz and Outer Oghuz lords will be invited and served to them. The hungry will be fed, the bare will be dressed, and the debtor will be freed from debt. The meat will be piled up like a hill, kumis will be distributed like a lake, a great feast will be organized and those whose

prayers are accepted will be asked for prayers. That way, Allah may give us a child (Gökyay, 1973, p. 6). Bourdieu emphasizes that humanity and collective practices have been produced in accordance with the forms produced by history. Accordingly, habitus ensures an active existence of past experiences, and this notion is embedded in the perception schemes of every organism through action. Habitus aims at securing the relevance and stability of practices more reliably than all official rules and distinct norms in the historical process (Bourdieu, 1995, p. 54). At the same time, the relationship between culture and power, one of the focal points Bourdieu draws attention to in social relations, gains significance in this context. This is because having a son is traditionally equivalent to having power in all societies. Having children is also significant in positioning the Oghuz lords in the Boğaç Khan Son of Dirse Khan Tribe. In order to have children, the focus has been on activism from past to present, whereby it is possible to be positioned with the appreciation patterns. Also, in the same story, the significance of having power is proved by the event in which forty brave men come between father and son.

Bourdieu defines the concept of habitus as a structuring mechanism. He states that habitus corresponds to the source of practical logic and the “sense of play” and that this sense of play functions as a principle, guiding the actions of the agent (Tatlıcan & Çeğin, 1992, p. 122). However, the player should find the game worth playing before anything else. Aware of the reward they will get at the end of the game, the players find their way into the field of domination with the help of the collective subconscious. In this context, habitus is a principle of a form of knowledge that does not require consciousness, of unplanned intentionality/orientation, and of practical domination of regularities in the world that enables one to steer towards the future without mentioning it explicitly (Bourdieu, 2007, p. 48). In the Boğaç Khan Son of Dirse Khan Tribe, while Dirse Khan’s son is playing knucklebones with his friends in the square, a bull is released and the children are told to run away. However, Dirse Khan’s son does not run. He has found the game worth playing. He confronts the bull and struggles with it. Neither the bull can prevail over the boy, nor the boy over the bull. Later, the boy realizes that his hand on the bull’s forehead is supporting him and withdraws his hand. He cuts the throat of the fallen bull. Then, Dede Kokut comes and names him Boğaç. Habitus is a principle that generates strategy based on previous experiences and imparts temperament and inclination to one’s action (Palabıyık, 2020, p. 10). The hero is initially the missing subject. In order to gain fullness, it needs to face and meet the outside world (Kanter, 2005, p. 132). As someone who grew up with the awareness that no name would be given unless he beheads and sheds blood, Boğaç Khan does not want to run away from the bull. He chooses to fight the bull while other kids get scared and run. It becomes possible for him to defeat the bull by putting into practice what he has learned so far. His award is him. Boğaç created a personal space for himself as someone who fulfills the requirements of his society.

## 2. Field

The term *field*, identified with the concept of space at the first moment in the mental world, gains meaning together with a person at the sociological level. Bourdieu defines the field as follows:

A network or configuration of objective relations between positions. These positions are objectively defined in their existence and the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions by their present or potential situations (*situs*) in the structure of the species of power (or capital) upon which access to specific

profits in the field depends, as well as by their objective relation to other positions (domination, subordination, homology, etc.)” (Swartz, 2018, p. 167).

When defining the concept of field, Bourdieu notes that he established this concept both against and with Weber, that is, he was both influenced by and opposed to Weber (As cited in Cocuff, 2007, p. 398). According to Bourdieu, social life cannot be examined solely in terms of economic factors and classes. Factors such as education and culture also play a great role in social life. From this perspective, unlike Marxism, which uses the concept of production relations and class in the economic infrastructure in analyzing society, he uses the concept he calls “*field*”. The field imposes its own boundaries and rules on those who attempt to enter those boundaries. This is the “field of power” according to Bourdieu. In the Deli Dumrul Son of Duha Koca Tribe, Deli Dumrul builds a bridge over a dry stream and receives thirty-three coins from those who pass through, and forty coins by force from those who do not (Gökyay, 1973, p. 75). The purpose of the show of power in the field determined by Deli Dumrul is to be known for his virility and bravery and to gain a reputation. So, he imposes the rules he has determined on those in his surroundings.

At the same time, the field is an arena of struggles where actors try to maintain or change their current situation, and there is a hierarchical battle here. Bourdieu calls this the “battlefield” (Tatlıcan & Çeğin, 2007, p. 400). When one delves into the story where the Outer Oghuz Revolted against the Inner Oghuz and Beyrek died, the battlefield that Bourdieu mentioned is seen. Kazan Bey gathers the Inner and Outer Oghuz lords every three years and has his house plundered. In the last plunder, only the Inner Oghuz Lords were present and plundered Kazan Bey’s property. Of Outer Oghuz Lords, Uruz, Emen, and other lords resent this situation. They do not come to the meeting held later and do not greet Kazan Bey. Thereupon, the relationship between Kazan Bey and the Outer Oghuz Lord, Aruz Koca, deteriorates (Gökyay, 1973, p. 145-146). Aruz Koca wants to see Beyrek with him against Kazan Bey. However, Beyrek denies this. Aruz Koca injures Beyrek who declares his loyalty to Kazan. Before dying, Beyrek wills to be avenged:

Tell him: A man came from your coward uncle Aruz and asked for Beyrek, and he came. We didn’t know that all the Outer Oghuz lords had gathered. They brought the Qur’an between eating and drinking. They said we revolted against Kazan and took an oath. Come on, and you also take an oath. He said I would not betray Kazan, your coward uncle got outraged and stabbed Beyrek with a sword. He was covered in dark blood. He said, tomorrow on the day of judgment, let my hand be on Kazan’s collar if he leaves my blood on Aruz (Gökyay, 1973, p. 149).

When the bad news reaches Kazan Khan, he rides horses on Outer Oghuz. He kills Aruz and makes the Outer Oghuz Lords pay allegiance to him. This way, Kazan Khan preserves and consolidates his position in the hierarchy on the battlefield.

The field also appears as a situation that arises, changes, and over time. In this case, the field has stages of isolating itself from external factors during development and developing its own criteria on and against neighbors and intruders. This is its “degree of autonomy” (Tatlıcan & Çeğin, 2007, p. 400). Seeing this degree of autonomy is possible in the Tribe where Basat Kills Tepegöz. Konur Koca Konur Koca Sarı Çoban catches one of the fairy girls in the spring and rapes her. The fairy girl warns Çoban that he has brought disaster to Oghuz. After a while, the fairy girl brings her one-eyed boy and leaves him to Oghuz. Getting permission from Bayındır Khan, Aruz Koca wants to raise this one-eyed boy with his son, Basat, who was raised

by lions. However, the boy kills the women who breastfeed him. He starts eating the ears and noses of the children he plays with. Aruz Koca expels the boy who does not listen to his warnings. Tepegöz flees to the mountains and becomes a bandit. He is protected by a magic ring given by his mother. Oghuz is devastated by Tepegöz's killing every passerby. Through Dede Korkut, a deal is made with Tepegöz over two men and five hundred sheep a day. Those with three children have two left, and those with two have one left. One of the two children of Kapak Kan was sacrificed to Tepegöz before, and it was the other one's turn. Kapak Kan's wife asks for help from Basat, who has returned from the battle. Basat decides to confront Tepegöz by going to Salahana Kaya. Noticing Basat, Tepegöz catches and puts him inside his boot to eat later. Basat tears down the boot with his dagger and gets out of there. Basat learns from Yünlü Koca and Yapağılı Koca, cooking Tepegöz's food, that Tepegöz's only flesh limb is his eye. He plunges the skewer he heated in the fire into Tepegöz's eye. He escapes from Tepegöz, who is waiting at the entrance of the cave, by wearing a ram's skin. After that, Tepegöz wants to catch Basat using his ring. Basat does not believe him! Tepegöz lets Basat into the cupola under the pretext of giving him his treasure. Losing himself for a moment by seeing the gold coins, Basat says "La ilaha İllallah, Muhammadun Rasulu'llah" (There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is his servant and messenger.) upon Tepegöz's move to destroy the cupola, and doors open from seven places. Basat's fourth salvation takes place by coming out through one of the opened doors. Tepegöz gets very angry at Basat who manages escape every trap. He wants to play one last game with him, saying that only the unsheathed sword in the cave can cut off his head but not knowing that he is preparing his own end. Basat solves Tepegöz's trick with his intelligence. Dodging him for the fifth time, Basat kills Tepegöz with his own sword. This way, he saves the Oghuz from disaster (Gökyay, 1973, p. 105-115). The field of autonomy in this tribe emerges as a result of the wrong behavior of Konur Koca Sarı Çoban. Oghuz's life entirely changes with Tepegöz. This is because Tepegöz creates his own rules for his own field. However, through Dede Korkut, the Oghuz offer their own conditions to Tepegöz, the intruder. This is the best of the bad for Oghuz. On the other hand, Tepegöz's defeat by Basat's struggle creates a different field. Through his struggle, Basat saves Oghuz from Tepegöz's atrocity.

Generally, looking at the field, there seems to be a constant struggle. Individuals have to constantly struggle on behalf of their society to reach their own limits. In this respect, one could argue that the game Bourdieu speaks of is a playground for an endless struggle. Bourdieu mentions three different types of field strategies, conservation, succession, and subversion. Conservation strategies are generally adopted by those in dominant positions and seniors of a field. Succession strategies are efforts to achieve dominant positions in a field and are generally adopted by new partakers. The third and final strategy, the subversion strategy, is adopted by those who do not expecting much from the dominant groups (Swartz, 2018, p. 177).

Dede Korkut stories have extremely important criteria for choosing a spouse. The woman must get up and get ready before the man, and before her husband gets on his horse, she must have gone over the enemy and brought a head. Therefore, the spouse a man chooses for himself should not be a random beautiful person but an alpine one, equal to him in all respects. The man determines the field of his dominance by choosing a spouse. His choice of spouse is an indicator of his field of power. The same struggle for power also applies to women. An alpine woman wants the person she marries to be capable of defeating her in the field of contest, as in the example of Banu Çiçek.

In the tribes, besides their life partners, their companions are also of great significance. Having forty brave men is one of the indicators of a man's field of power. Kan Turalı calls out to his brave men with the words "*Hey my forty partners, forty companions / May my head be sacrificed for you*" (Gökyay, 1973, p. 92). During his battle with monsters, he asks his forty brave men to praise him. This way, he intends to create a new field for himself. The loss of forty brave men also means that the field will be hurt. For this reason, the man does not enter the bridal chamber without rescuing his forty brave men in captivity, swearing that he will not.

### 3. Capital

After defining the field, Bourdieu defines "capital" as everything that is achieved by efforts to reign in the field. According to Bourdieu, there are four types of capital: cultural, social, symbolic, and economic capital (Kaplan & Yardımcıoğlu, 2020, p. 30).

#### 3a. Cultural Capital

According to Bourdieu, economic and cultural capital determine an individual's position. Individuals take their positions according to the weight of economic and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1995, p. 20). Cultural capital is a type of capital that individuals earn from the moment they are born. All practices acquired from birth onward in the social space throughout social life, especially in educational environments and the family, constitute the cultural capital. Cultural capital is, in one sense, the "knowledge capital". Families transfer what they have learned from their elders to their children and involve their children in their own educational processes, ensuring that this system is regenerated and cultural capital is passed on from generation to generation. In other words, cultural capital is a form that can be understood from the educational quality, harmonious behavior, and style or the domination of appealing products and assets (Crossley, 2001, p. 87).

Particularly, with the education transferred to the child through the family, the child learns the practices of the ruling class, being surrounded by cultural capital in this way. Dresden, in his manuscript "Mukaddime", refers to the importance of family in transferring cultural capital through his sentences: "*Daughter does not get advice unless she sees it from her mother. Son does not set the dining table unless he sees it from his father...*" (Gökyay, 1973, p. 1).

In the Story which Kazan Beg's Son Uruz Beg is Captive, Salar Kazan looks to his right in the feast he organized, sees Kara Göne, and sniggers. He looks to his left and sees his uncle Aruz Koca and becomes very happy. When he looks ahead, he sees his son Uruz and starts crying. Uruz gets very disturbed and asks his father why he is acting like that. His father says that he is happy that both Kara Göne and Aruz gained recognition for beheading, but he was upset because Uruz did not even draw a bow, shoot arrows, chop off a head, and shed blood despite reaching his sixteen. "*Although the dynasty or principality is inherited from father to son through blood in the Oghuz, the ability of a person to be a khan or lord to have administrative power depends to some extent on his heroism*" (Bekki, 2016, p. 76). That is why, Salar Kazan is concerned that his crown and throne will not be transferred to his son, who has not yet become competent. As the sentences show, "*A son not carrying his father's name is better not to descend from the father's waist and is better not to be born when falls into the mother's womb. When carries the father's name, the great and wealthy son is better*" mentioned in the *Introduction*, in Dede Korkut Stories, the son keeps his father's name alive,

ensuring the continuance of his lineage (Gökyay, 1973, p. 2). In this context, Salur Kazan's concern about his son Uruz is natural. However, Uruz's response to his father reveals the education system in Dede Korkut Stories:

“Oh dad, you have grown as big as a camel, you have no brain as much as its cub. You have grown as much as a hill, you have no brain as much as a millet. Do sons learn skills from fathers or do fathers learn from sons? When did you take to the border of infidels and chopped off heads using a sword? What did I see and learn from you? He said” (Gökyay, 1973, p. 60).

Accordingly, the father is a key point in children's education. The father is responsible for passing on all he has learned in his life adventure to his son. Uruz clearly states that his lack of cultural capital stems from his father. His father also finds his son right and decides to take him to places he chops off heads swinging his sword. This way, cultural capital will be transferred from one generation to another.

### 3b. Social Capital

Social capital emerges along with using potential and actual resources related to having/saving constant networks (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 190). In Dresden's manuscript introduction, Dede Korkut is introduced as follows:

“Close to the time of the Prophet (peace be upon him), a man called Korkut Ata appeared from the Bayat tribe. He was Oghuz's all-knowing man. Whatever he said would happen. He provided all kinds of news from the unknown. May Allah inspire his heart. Korkut Ata said: In the end, the khanate will pass to Kayı. No one will be able to take it away from them, until the end of time and the doomsday. What he said is the Ottoman generation, and here it goes. And he uttered many similar words. Korkut Ata would solve the problems of the Oghuz tribe. Nothing would be done without consulting Korkut Ata. Whatever he commanded, they would accept. They would honor his words and fulfill them.” (Gökyay, 1973, p. 1).

Dede Korkut is the all-knower of Oghuz. What he says happens and gives news from the unknown. The Ottoman domination confirms the news he gives from the unknown. Nothing can be done without consulting Dede Korkut. Dede Korkut is someone who saves Oghuz from difficult situations. Dede Korkut asks Banı Çiçek for Bamsı Beyrek from his tough brother. Dede Korkut negotiates with Tepegöz to save the Oghuz from the difficult situation that Tepegöz put them through. When it is time to give a name, he provides. When it is time to pray, he prays. Dede Korkut's social capital places him at the highest status in the Oghuz. Social capital refers to the network of relations that individuals have in the field in which they are involved. An individual's connections with others, group memberships, and the responsibilities and privileges these relations impose on the individual constitute the content of social capital (Göker, 2007, p. 282). The Khan of Khans Bayındır Khan holds administrative power. He fulfills the duties and responsibilities given to him by the lords. He issues the raid and hunting permits. In the stories, social capital is seen as a result of the heroes' efforts to exist and introduce themselves in the universe where they live.

### 3c. Economic Capital

Economic capital is directly related to the economy and is obtained only through the acquisition and possession of financial resources. Economic capital is a concrete manifestation of money and commodity relations. Ownership of tangible property and wealth are reflections



of economic capital. Economic capital should not be considered money alone, tangible properties such as houses, cars, and lands that can be converted into money can also be included in economic capital.

As it appears from the expressions such as “barns of agile horses”, “lines of camels”, “tumen sheep”, “golden-domed house”, “golden-foot pitchers”, and “silk carpet in a thousand places” frequently mentioned in Dede Korkut Stories, the Oghuz lords are very rich (Daşdemir, 2012, p. 71). The spoils they obtain through wars and the tributes they receive from the surrounding countries also contribute to the enrichment of the Oghuz, whose economic life was largely based on animal husbandry. This economic wealth earned by the Oghuz is shared among all Oghuz lords under the name of “looting” every three years. “The long-necked horse”, “the tumen sheep”, “the red camel”, and “the golden-domed house” (Gökyay, 1973, p. 7) given to the alps by their fathers to marry are also among the types of economic capital: In the Boğaç Khan Son of Dirse Khan Tribe, when Dirse Khan’s son knocked down and defeated the bull, Dede Korkut comes and calls out to Dirse Khan:

“Hey Dirse Khan, give this boy a principality. Give him a throne, he is virtuous. Give this boy a big breed long-necked horse, he is skillful. Let him be a rider. Give this boy ten thousand sheep from the barns for meat, he is skillful. Give this boy a red camel, let it be load-bearer. He is skillful. Give this boy a golden-headed tent to be a shadow, he is virtuous. Give this boy a robe with a bird on the shoulder to wear, he is skillful. This boy fought in Bayındır Khan’s white square. Your son killed a bull, let his name be Boğaç. I gave him his name. May Allah give his age” (Gökyay, 1973, p. 7).

Boğaç Khan’s heroism enabled him to gain the social capital, and name, and acquire the economic capital that comes with social capital. After defeating the enemy, Begil’s son Emren is also rewarded by his father with a “barn of horses” and “tumen sheep” to sacrifice at feasts as well as owns a certain amount of the booties taken from the enemy (Gökyay, 1973, p. 123).

### 3d. Symbolic Capital

The fourth type of capital that Bourdieu mentioned is symbolic capital. Symbolic capital is defined in interaction with other types of capital. Therefore, one could argue that symbolic capital includes all other types of capital to certain levels. According to Bourdieu, symbolic capital is portrayed as economic, cultural, or social from the moment it is perceived according to classification systems and patterns of perception categories, which are the product of the distribution structure of capital in the field under consideration (Bourdieu, 1995, p. 158). In this context, Dede Korkut, who figures as Oghuz’s “all-knower” in all stories, appears in critical scenes, and represents the social consciousness, presenting a structure that encompasses all types of capital. In the Deli Dumrul Son of Duha Koca Tribe, the bridge Deli Dumrul built for his bravery and glory and the adjective “deli” before his name, which characterizes his bravery, indicates Deli Dumrul’s symbolic capital.

Human’s efforts to prove their existence and create their own spaces in the community where they live lead them to several behavioral patterns. Humans want to expand their field with each capital they assume and maintain this field with the capitals as mentioned earlier. In this process, these types of capital support each other, develop each other, and become an inseparable whole by taking on an intricate structure. In Dede Korkut Stories, the types of capital support each other and one type of capital can help the acquisition of another. For

instance, Basat's being raised by lions and getting his name without chopping off a head allows him to assume his symbolic capital. His symbolic capital facilitates his communication and relationships with his family and society. In this context, one could say that Basat's symbolic capital paved the way for his social capital.

#### 4. Conclusion

Literary texts are products that reflect the position of people and societies in the world and their quest for meaning in a multifaceted way. Performing multifaceted readings is possible based on texts that have taken on a historical identity with their written periods. In this context, every text that emerges through language, the way people and societies express themselves, offers a structure that includes a holistic analysis of the people and society of the period when it was written, apart from literature researchers. Therefore, literary texts play a key role in forming social theories about the lives of people and societies or in analyzing an existing social structure.

Pierre Bourdieu tried to reveal social reality with the methodology he put forward and the concepts he introduced to social sciences. Bourdieu's theory and the concepts he uses appear in literary works as well as in social life. Thus, referring to the events in Dede Korkut Stories in this study, many determinations were made about how Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, space, and capital correspond in the mentioned work.

Bourdieu's theory is grounded on explaining social reality through the definitions of concepts such as habitus, space, and capital. Using Bourdieu's conceptual tools enables one to approach the process of explaining the dualities in social life and the process of explaining social phenomena from different perspectives. Using Bourdieu's concepts of space, habitus, and capital, the lives of Oghuz Turks were viewed from a different perspective in the social context of Dede Korkut Stories, and the study showed that these concepts can be used when explaining social events.

All kinds of social, cultural, symbolic, and economic capital owned by the Oghuz lords are listed one by one in the epithets assigned to each Oghuz lord. Whenever Salur Kazan, one of the most important heroes in Dede Korkut Stories, makes an appearance, his characteristics such as "the son of Ulaş", "the pretty bird's nestling", "the hope of the poor", "the Lion of Amit Water", "the Tiger of Karachuk", "the owner of the Konur horse", "the Khan Uruz's lord", "Bayındır Khan's son-in-law", "the wealth of the Kalın Oghuz", and "the strongest man" describing his position in the Oghuz society and highlighting his dignity and being an alp are shouted one after another. Attributions such as "the pretty bird's nestling" in epithet can be defined as symbolic capital because referring to Salur Kazan's mythical characteristic and "the owner of the brown horse" can be defined as economic capital because of referring to richness. Also, attributions such as "Bayındır Khan's son-in-law", "the hope of the poor", "the wealth of the Kalın Oghuz", and "the strongest man" can be defined as the social capital of Salur Kazan, indicating dignity and influence.

At the end of each story in Dede Korkut Stories, the heroes are provided with symbolic, social, and economic capital once they complete their adventures, reaching a happy ending. This is often recorded by Dede Korkut's storytelling and reading poems.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> A better understanding of Bourdieu's concepts depends on understanding the dualism in question. Dualism is a theory that draws attention to an irreducible distinction between two types of something (Marshall, 1999, p. 326). Descartes' approach, called dualism, consists of material bodies on the one hand, and souls or minds determined by thought on the other (Marshall, 1999, p. 145). In social sciences, distinctions such as state-civil society, private space-public space, and nature-culture, often defined as dual oppositions, are frequently used. Theoretically, the concept of duality is used for variables that are considered to exclude each other and have only two categories (Marshall, 1999, p. 327). Although there are nuances between them, all three concepts try to decipher the social by constructing two poles. Bourdieu draws attention to the subject-object distinction from dualism, used to explain the social, and defines subjectivist and objectivist approaches, the extensions of this distinction, as the critical barrier to the development of social sciences (Bourdieu, 1995, s. 171).

<sup>2</sup> Bourdieu defines space as follows, "...social space....can be presented as diagram indicators. Social space is an abstract representation, deliberately structured, like a map, gives a bird's-eye view, a point of view on the whole set of points from which ordinary agents (including sociologists and their readers in their ordinary behaviors) see the world. Coming together in simultaneity, in the scope of a single glance...the agents can never apprehend in their totality and in their multiple relationships" (Bourdieu, 1982, p. 169). "I have acquired a habit of quoting a very famous saying of Pascal by a little modification: The world twists and swallows me like a speck, though I encompass it. However, that speck is a perspective. It is the origin of a perspective whose form and content are determined by that position, from whichever objective position an opinion is based on a point in social space" (Bourdieu, 2006, p. 26-27).

<sup>3</sup> Doxa is Bourdieu's term for preconscious understandings that shape our thoughts regarding the universe and our place in it and do not question reality. Doxa, a felt reality, is something that we do not tolerate objections to, but is prioritized for a possible objection and varies according to culture and field (Calhoun, 2007, p. 101).

### References

- Bekki, S. (2016). *Dedem Korkut Kitabı arařtırmaları*. Elazığ: Manas Yayıncılık.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc J. D. Wacquant (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and L. J. D. (2010). Wacquant. *Düşünümsel bir antropoloji için cevaplar*. Trans. Nazlı Ökten. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Bourdieu, P. (2002). Pierre Bourdieu on marriage strategies. *Population and Development Review*, 28/3, September 2002, 549-558.
- Bourdieu, P. (2015). *Ayırım beğeni yargısının toplumsal eleştirisi*. Trans. Derya Fırat and Günce Berkurt. Ankara: Heretik Yayınları.
- Bourdieu, P. (1995). *Pratik nedenler*. Trans. Hülya Tufan. İstanbul: Kesit Yayıncılık.
- Bourdieu, P. (2006). *Sanatın kuralları*. Trans. Necmettin Kamil Sevil. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in question*. Trans. Richard Nice. London: Sage Publications.

- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production: essays on art and literature*. USA: Columbia University Press.
- Calhoun, C. (2007). *Bourdieu sosyolojisinin ana hatları. Ocak ve zanaat: Pierre Bourdieu derlemesi*. Der. Güney Çetin vd. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Corcuff, P. (2007). *Habitustan hareketle: kolektife meydan okuyan tekil. Ocak ve zanaat: Pierre Bourdieu derlemesi*. Der. Güney Çeğin vd. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Crossley, N. (2001). The phenomenological habitus and its construction. *Theory and Society* 30/1 (2001), 81-120.
- Daşdemir, M. (2010). Dedem Korkut Kitabı / genel değerlendirme. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten*. 2010/II, Ankara: TDK Yayınları, (2012), 67-90.
- Göker, E. (2007). *Ekonomik indirgemeci mi dediniz? Ocak ve Zanaat: Pierre Bourdieu derlemesi*. Der. Güney Çeğin vd. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Gökay, O. Ş. (1973). *Dedem Korkudun kitabı*. İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Basımevi.
- Kanter, M. F. (2005). Dede Korkut Hikâyelerinin arketipsel sembolizm yöntemiyle çözümlenmesi. *Araştırmalar İnsan Bilimleri Araştırmaları*. 7 (2005), 131-138.
- Kaplan, M. and M. Y. (2020). Alan, habitus ve sermaye kavramlarıyla Pierre Bourdieu. *HABITUS Toplumbilim Dergisi*. 1 (2020), 23-37.
- Lizardo, O. (2004). The cognitive origins of Bourdieu's habitus. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*. 34/4 (2004), 375-401.
- Marshall, G. (1999). *Sosyoloji sözlüğü*. Trans. Osman Akınhay ve Derya Kömürcü. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Swartz, D. L. (2002). The sociology of habit: the perspective of Pierre Bourdieu. *The Occupational Therapy Journal of Research*. 22 (Winter 2002), 61-69.
- Swartz, D. L. (2018). *Kültür ve iktidar Pierre Bourdieu'nün sosyolojisi*. Trans. Elçin Gen. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Tatlıcan, Ü. and G. Ç. (2007). *Bourdieu ve Giddens: habitus veya yapının ikiliği. Ocak ve Zanaat: Pierre Bourdieu Derlemesi*. Der. Güney Çeğin et al. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Tatlıcan, Ü. and G. Ç. (2007). *Pierre Bourdieu'nun pratik kuramının kilidi: alan kavramı. Ocak ve Zanaat: Pierre Bourdieu Derlemesi*. Der. Güney Çeğin et al. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Wacquant, L. J. D. (2007). *Chapter 16: Pierre Bourdieu. key sociological thinkers*. Ed. Rob Stones. USA: New York. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ziya Gökalp. (1976). *Türk medeniyet tarihi*. İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

### Geniş Özet

20. yüzyılın önde gelen düşünürlerinden biri olan Pierre Bourdieu, sosyal bilimlere alanına yeni kavramlar kazandırmasının yanında mevcut kavramların kapsamını da genişletmiştir. Bilincin toplumu, aynı zamanda toplumun da bilinci şekillendirdiğinin farkında olan Bourdieu, sosyal uzamda bireyin bireysel davranışını en nesnel biçimde, toplumun yapısal özellikleri açısından temellendirmeye çalışmıştır. Bu bağlamda felsefe, sosyoloji, psikoloji, dil vb. alanların araştırma ilkelerini aynı çatı altında sentezleyerek kendi sosyolojik araştırma yöntemini oluşturmuştur. Bourdieu, her kavram ve kuramın incelenen olgu ve olaya göre açıklayıcılığının değişebileceği varsayımından yola çıkarak kavramlar arasındaki ikiliklere eleştirel bir bakış açısı getirmiştir.

Bourdieu, nesnel ve öznel bilgi biçimlerini bütünleştirerek genel pratikler bilimi altında birleştirmeyi ve insan eylemi hakkında fikir geliştirmeye engel olan genel karşıtlıkların sosyal bilimlere olan zararını en aza indirerek fikir sahibi olmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu bağlamda kuramsallaştırma ile ampirik araştırma aynı çatı altında birleştirilmelidir. Bourdieu'nun bu çabası, toplumsal yaşam içerisinde yer alan ikilikleri ortaya çıkarmak ve ortaya çıkan bu ikilikleri sosyolojik açıklamalar ile bütünleştirerek dünyanın nesnel-öznel, içsel-dışsal, bireysel-toplumsal inceliklerini arama ve anlamlandırmaya yöneliktir.

Bourdieu, araştırmalarını ortaya koyarken öncelikle onları ortak olgulardan koparır. Bu doğrultuda sosyal gerçeklik içeren doktrinlerin, tutumların, değer yargılarının araştırmadan arındırılması gerektiğini düşünür. Daha sonraki adımı ise bilimsel konunun inşa edilmesidir. Bunun için araştırma, genel ifadelerden arındırılmalı yeni bir fikir dizaynı ile baştan inşa edilmelidir. Dolayısıyla Bourdieu'nun araştırmalarında pratik ve teoride dairesel bir döngü söz konusudur. Bourdieu'nun alan, habitus ve sermaye kavramları neden ve sonuç arasında iki yönlü, dönüşlü dairesel ilişkiler kurarak sosyal bilimlerde eylemin kendisini tetikleyen etmenleri anlamlandırmaya çalışır.

Bourdieu incelemelerinde, bireysel davranışlardan ziyade bireylerin ortak pratiklerine yani sosyal uzama ve nesnel uzama veya bu ortak pratiklerin içinde eylendiği kurumsal veya kamusal alanlara odaklanır. Bourdieu, nesnellik düşüncesinin temelini genel yapıyı veya alanı yerleştirir. İnceleme alanını bireysel düzlemde değil nesnel yapı kavramı temelinde bütüncül olarak ele alan Bourdieu, ilgisini oluşturulmuş ortak pratiklere yöneltir. Bu durum ise Bourdieu'nun toplumsal sınıfları anlamaya yönelik bir tutum geliştirdiğine işaret eder. *Ayırım* adlı çalışmasında sınıfsal ve kültürel çözümlenmeleri mezmetmek suretiyle sınıfsal hâkimiyetin kültürel mekanizmalarını ortaya çıkarmaya odaklanır.

Bourdieu, özne-nesne, bilinç-beden, içkin-aşkın, içsel-dışsal, soyut-somut gibi düalist tutumlardan vazgeçilerek irdelenen konuya her iki açıdan bütüncül bir şekilde yaklaşılması gerektiğini vurgular. Bu bağlamda sadece içsel okumayla edebî sanat yapıtlarını çözümlenmeyi amaçlayan hermeneutik ve varlık felsefesi gibi yaklaşımlar Bourdieu'ya göre hatalı araştırma yöntemleridir. Bourdieu, eylemi tek yönlü incelemek istemediği için teoriyle pratiği birlikte yürütür. Karl Marx, Marcel Mauss, Max Weber, Émile Durkheim, Ernst Cassirer, Gaston Bachelard, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Ferdinand de Saussure, Noam Chomsky, Maurice Merleau-Ponty ve Alfred Schutz gibi sosyolog, dilbilimci ve fenomenologların görüşlerini sentezleyen Bourdieu, teorik kaynaklardan elde ettiği verilerle kuramlarını şekillendirir. Böylece objektivizmi, sübjektivizmi, toplumsal fiziği ve sosyal fenomenolojiyi ve ayrıca dil bilimi birbirleriyle sentezleyerek habitus, sermaye, alan ve doxa kavramlarıyla hayat bulan "orijinal bir kavramsal cephanelik" kurmuştur.

Bu çalışmada, Bourdieu'nun sosyal bilimlere alanındaki ikiliklere müdahaleye dayalı anlayışıyla geliştirdiği alan, habitus ve sermaye gibi kavramların edebî metinleri anlamlandırmada ve yorumlamada etkili olduğunu ortaya koymak amaçlanmaktadır. Çalışma, Bourdieu'nun bu kavramlarıyla yapılacak yeni edebî incelemelere de kapı aralamaktadır. Alanında bir ilk olan bu çalışmada, Türkiye ile Azerbaycan ve Türkmenistan'da da hemen her çevrede okunup saygı gösterilmesi ve de Türk milli kültür birikiminin önemli bir taşıyıcısı olması sebebiyle Dede Korkut Hikâyeleri seçilmiştir.

Pierre Bourdieu, ortaya koyduğu metodoloji ve sosyal bilimlere alanına kazandırdığı kavramlar ile sosyal gerçekliği ortaya koymaya çalışmıştır. Bourdieu'nun teorisi ve kullandığı kavramlar sosyal yaşamda olduğu gibi edebî eserlerde de karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Buradan hareketle bu çalışmada Dede Korkut Hikâyelerinde geçen olaylara göndermeler yapılarak Bourdieu'nun habitus, alan ve sermaye kavramlarının bahsi geçen eserde nasıl karşılık bulduğuna yönelik birçok tespitte bulunulmuştur.

Bourdieu'nun teorisinin temelinde habitus, alan ve sermaye gibi kavramların tanımları aracılığıyla toplumsal gerçekliği açıklamak yatmaktadır. Bourdieu'nun kavramsal araçları ile toplumsal yaşamdaki ikiliklere ilişkin açıklamalar ve toplumsal olguların açıklanması sürecine farklı bakış açılarıyla yaklaşılabilmesine imkân sağlamaktadır. Bourdieu'nun alan, habitus ve sermaye kavramları ile Dede Korkut Hikâyelerinin toplumsal bağlamına, Oğuz Türklerinin yaşamlarına farklı bir bakış açısıyla bakılabilmeye; kavramların toplumsal olayların açıklanması sürecinde kullanılabilir olduğu gözlemlenmiştir.

Oğuz beylerinin sahip oldukları her türlü sosyal, kültürel, simgesel ve ekonomik sermaye; her bir Oğuz beyine koşulan epitetlerde bir bir sıralanmıştır. Dede Korkut Hikâyelerinde geçen en önemli kahramanlardan Salur Kazan, ne zaman sahneye çıksa onun Oğuz toplumu içerisindeki konumunu belirten; saygınlığına ve alplığına vurgu yapan, “Ulaş oğlu”, “tülü kuşun yavrısı”, “beze miskin umudu”, “Amıt suyunun aslanı”, “Karaçuğun kaplanı”, “konır atun iyisi”, “Han Uruzun ağası”, “Bayındır Hanun güyegüsü”, “Kalın Oğuzun devleti”, “kalmış yiğit arhası” gibi özellikleri her defasında art arda sıralanır. Epitette geçen “tülü kuşun yavrısı”, Salur Kazan'ın mitsel özelliğine atıf yaptığı için simgesel sermaye; “konır atun iyisi” olmak zenginliğine işaret ettiğinden ekonomik sermaye; “Bayındır Hanun güyegüsü”, “beze miskin umudu”, “Kalın Oğuzun devleti” ve “kalmış yiğit arhası” gibi sıfatlar ise saygınlık ve nüfuz göstergesi olduğu için Salur Kazan'ın sahip olduğu sosyal sermaye olarak tanımlanabilir.

Dede Korkut Hikâyelerinde her bir boyun sonunda kahraman, macerasını tamamlayıp mutlu sona ulaştığında simgesel, sosyal ve ekonomik sermayeyle donatılır. Bu da çoğu zaman Dede Korkut'un gelip “boy boylayıp”, “soy soylamasıyla” kayıt altına alınmış olur.