

MYTHOLOGICALISM IN THE TATAR LITERATURE OF THE 1960-80S (ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE WORKS BY I. YUZEEV AND M. YUNYS)

¹LANDYSH R. FAEZOVA, ²GULFIA R. GAYNYLLINA,
³NURFIYA M. YUSUPOVA, ⁴AINUR MASHAKOVA

^{a,b,c} Kazan Federal University, 18 Kremlyovskaya street, Kazan
420008, Russian Federation

^dM.O. Auezov Institute of Literature and Art, Almaty,
Kazakhstan

email: ^agulfiarasilevna@mail.ru, ^binfo@ores.s, ^cglobal@ores.su,
^drussia@prescopus.com

Abstract: This article studies mythology in the Tatar literature of the 1960s and 1980s based on the examples of the works by Ildar Yuzev (1933-2004) and Mirgaziyan Yunys (1927 - 2014). It reveals the transformation of mythological images and plots in epic and lyric-epic works from the point of view of their functions, role and literary significance. In the course of studying, attention is focused on their use as a symbol as a structure-forming component or a means for narrative structuring. The relevance of the paper is determined by the insufficient coverage on the study of mythology in the Tatar literature of the 1960-1980s. In the course of the research, it is asserted that through the prism of mythological images and plots the works by I. Yuzev and M. Yunys form an idea of national problems, evolve a new social and philosophical concept that unites the national idea, social and human philosophy. Fundamental to our study is the hermeneutic approach directing the receptive activity of the reader to the analysis of principles and ways of representation, the definition of typological similarities and the specificity of literary searches coinciding and having differences in different periods of verbal art and in different literary genres. In this way the mythology and its poetic originality are revealed in the Tatar literature of the 1960s-1980s.

Keywords: Tatar literature, mythology, mythological images, mythological plots, structure.

1 Introduction

Tatar literature of the second half of the twentieth century is characterized as a transitional phase associated with the denial of the former ideological and cultural benchmarks and distinguished by innovations in social and philosophical thought, changes in literary and aesthetic thought. At this stage of verbal art, on the one hand, the processes of revealing national identity are activated. Thereafter, the problems of national self-identification, national self-awareness come to the fore in the Tatar works. Tatar literature of the second half of the twentieth century is marked by an era of return to national sources in general. On the other hand, innovations are structured by an active search for new devices and means of figurative expressiveness, enriching the content and form of literary work, and improving symbolic thinking. This tendency contributes to the activation of mythological images and plots, the intensification of mythology in verbal art. According to E. M. Meletinsky, mythology is a characteristic phenomenon of the literature of the twentieth century, both as a literary device and a world attitude behind it (Meletinsky, 1976). In the Tatar literature of this period uses mythological images and plots in the status of a symbol, like in Russian literature, myth stands for "universal model for constructing symbols" (Shelogurova, 1986).

Certain studies of this issue based on the material of the folklore of the Barabinsk Tatars have already been undertaken by V. V. Radlov (Sayfulina & Karabulatova, 2014). The main mechanisms of using and transforming mythological subjects, folklore images in the Tatar literature, the language of works of literature, the dialogue of cultural traditions by Tatar scholars have been studied in respect of one or another aspect (Motigullina et al, 2016; Kajumova et al, 2017; Zakirzyanov & Ghilazov, 2016). However, no special studies covering the theme of mythology on the material of the Tatar literature of the 1960s-1980s have been conducted so far. This paper analyzes this problem in a broader literary context. The object of our study is the Tatar literature of the 1960-1980s, in particular the works by I. Yuzev and M. Yunys. The subject of the study is mythology in the Tatar literature of the 1960-1980s.

2 Methods

The basis for our study is the hermeneutic approach (Robert, 1999; Abrams & Harpham, 2009), which assumes that the

reader, while getting a feel for the diverse cultural values fixed in the literature, finds his place on their borders. It directs the receptive activity of the reader to comprehend the principles and means of representation, the literary forms of mastering reality, highlighting and thorough understanding the typological similarities and peculiarities of literary schools and trends that coincide and differ in different literatures. Thus, using the hermeneutic approach, we suppose to gain insight into the essence of mythology in the Tatar literature of the 1960s-1980s, to detect the specificity of adaptation or transformation of mythological images and plots in the works by I. Yuzev and M. Yunys

3 Results and Discussion

Each national literature has its own "mythological tradition": images and stories of "early" mythology, most frequently used in national literature (Ibragimov, 2003; Mobbalegh Naseri et al, 2018). Tatar literature is inextricably linked with mythology, the totality of myths belonging to Turkic-Tatar, Islamic and world mythology. The activation of mythology in Tatar literature is vividly apparent already at the beginning of the twentieth century. Especially in Tatar modernist poems, the subject of the narrative is mythological images and plots that belong to different sources and times. Firstly, it was the revival of the folklore paradigm in secular literature, and secondly, the continuation of the traditions of medieval Eastern literature, preserved despite the activation of the dialogue with Russian and European literature. The pronounced mythology of literature continues in the 1920-50s, however, gradually, in the opinion of Kh. Gyunter, "it becomes an official reservoir of state myths" (Gunter, 2000; Villalobos Antúnez & Bozo, 2010). The beginning of socio-political reforms is accompanied by a subconscious approximation of literature to ideological mythology, mythopoetic universals and archetypes.

Qualitative changes have begun in the national literature since the 1960s. Innovations in philosophical and social thought, in literary activity are explained by the weakening of rigid ideological attitudes, which leads to the humanization of literature. Tatar literature returns to national sources, traditions of Tatar literature of the early twentieth century. This tendency is clearly manifested in the activation of mythological images and subjects belonging to the Tatar folk art. Mythologism especially manifests itself in the works that are oriented to and aimed at universal human values. However, in the Tatar poetry of the 1960s-1980s, the themes and images of world mythology are already prevailing, or the Turkic-Tatar myths are being "transformed". This tendency is most pronounced in the works by I. Yuzev.

Make an analysis of the poem by I. Yuzev "Meeting with Eternity" (1982) by way of illustration of the possibilities of using world mythology in national literature. In terms of composition, the poem is represented as a synthesis of the realistic, mythological and philosophical strata. These layers have ties to a time line, which dialogically causes to collide two understandings of "cosmic": metahistorical and concrete-historical, social. In the course of studying mythology in modern Tatar literature, M. Ibragimov comes to the conclusion that "the combination of realistic and fantastic-mythological layers ... reflects the essence of transitional processes in Tatar literature: on the one hand, this is a desire to preserve realism, on the other - the search for literary novelty" (Ibragimov, 2003). A similar idea can be applied to the material of this poem. The realistic layer collects together the events of the excavation conducted by archaeologist Atlant in the battlefields. In the structure of the poem the prologue of the work forms it compositionally.

The mythological plot laid down in the basis of the work is a myth passed by Plato, a legend of the once-vanished Atlantis. In the mythological story of a happy land - Atlantis, literary convention is transformed into effective means of a generalized

manifestation of the world view and a profound revelation of the author's position. The island, as the main component of the chronotope, is sacrificed and likened to the "sacred island" and forms the opposition of the Sacred / Secular: "We – the Atlanteans, were a proud people, / We lived on the island of Atlantis, / Having abandoned disputes and wars, / Conquered Freedom, sowed Joy, reaped Happiness. / The leader was – hero Atlant, his mind is the Earth, / the Force is the ocean, the feelings are the great sea ... / "And the kings are we, and we are the god, and we are the titan, / All the atlantes are equal on this island" (Yuzeyev, 1985). Vitalizing the image of Atlantis, the poet builds an ideal model of life. Two worlds are connected by the Rainbow, which is perceived in a symbolic perspective as a reunion of real and unreal worlds.

The main characters of the work are Atlant and his son Icarus, the other mythologemes – mythical Greek gods – are perceived as the symbols, and present the philosophical idea of the work. As in the lyrics of the poet, "each of the images is semantically equivalent to the other one and introduces its own semantic shades into the cumulative chain" (Yuzeyev, 1985). Atlant comes into focus as a proud, purposeful, strong person, and serves as a unifier of earth and sky, real and ideal worlds.

Ikar in the poem acts as an astronaut, dreams to conquer the vast expanses of the universe. Icarus is known in mythology as the son of Daedalus, who flies up to the sun with the wings made by his father, burns his wings and heroically dies. I. Yuzeyev, using demythologization, describes Icarus as "an unflinching Icarus of the modern era", portrays him to be with a strong spirit - a representative of the future generation.

Besides, the poem presents the Greek gods to be the owners of the Mount Olympus – the main god Zeus and his children: Athena – born from the head of Zeus, the goddess of the Blue Heavens, Hades – the god of the Underworld, Ares – the god of war, Ananka – the goddess of Fate – all they recreate the author's position and are structured as archetypal symbols. In the work concerning "the dark sides" of the nature of Zeus, there is an archetype of the shadow, which is the representation of anger and revenge in the character.

Aray symbolizes a strong militancy, savagery and cruelheartedness. The symbol of eternal fire frequently repeated in the poem also originates from mythology. The sacred fire, the fire of torch Atlanta, the fire of Herostratus – all are united around the Eternal Flame. In the structure of the text, it symbolizes, first of all, the force capable of burning all life, the whole world to ashes, secondly, the wars, and thirdly, the memories of the victims of these wars. The image of Athena symbolizes the sublime and acts as a symbol of the romantically exalted Beauty, reflecting the perfect stage of divine beauty and great mind. Thus, in the poem the main conflict boils down to the collision of the Man with the Gods, from subjective perspective it is perceived as a confrontation between Good and Evil. The eternity of the gods turns into the means of revealing eternity and the power of evil.

In the prose works by Mirgaziyan Yunys "mythology" acts as a literary means, representing the metaphorical interpretation of the author's imagination, becomes a tool of narrative structuring. He freely turns to the images and motifs of traditional mythologies, uses them as the material for independent literary organization of the text, which helps him to build up an internal metaphorical content, providing polysemy.

For example, in the story "Candles Burn only in Candlesticks" (1979), the author, by directly referring to the Tatar folk song "Guljamal", connects the doomed fate of Tatar women with social history. For this purpose, the author applies the allusion to the myth of the Arachnes from Greek mythology, the interpretation of which reveals the deep meaning of the historical phenomenon. Mythological parallels lay stress on the repetition of the same insoluble social collisions.

M. Junys often turns to archetypal images, which are a model of social life. Female images in the person of the beloved of

protagonist Sayrin Salakhov, Raziya Islamnurova, and his mother Minzifa apa symbolize and share the principle of femininity: Razia – as the goddess of love and beauty, as well as fertility, along with self-sacrificingness, Minzifa apa – a motherland and a holy woman. Mother's holiness takes its archetypal rise partly from Islamic traditions, partly from the Turkic image of Umai-ana's mother, who is exalted as a deity and patroness of children.

Also in the story, the repeatedly the images of willow and weeping willow used more than once carry a subjective metaphorical load of the mythology of the Tree of Life, which signifies the close connection between the relatives of the family. The roots symbolize the past, the history and the beginning of the family. The image of a weeping willow, as a symbol of the Tree of life and well-being, is mentioned in the stream of thoughts of the protagonist in relation to the head of the family, where the family in peacetime gathered together for an evening tea party under an immense tree. The same image of a weeping willow is developed by M. Yunys in the story "Our House Was Under Willows", which indicates the narrative integrity of the author's style. The image of the willow in the story plays a structure-forming role, conveyed not only by the plot, but also by the genre. Here the mythology of the Tree of Life indicates the identity of the problematic, representing the philosophical background of life and death. From the mouth of an elderly emigrant, whom the narrator encountered at the cemetery of an absolutely foreign land, the repeated sentence "Our house was under willows" sounds like an affirmation of the possibility of a happy, harmonious life only in our native land.

4 Summary

1. The Tatar literature of the 1960s-1980s is inseparably linked with mythology, the totality of myths belonging to Turkic-Tatar and world mythology. The use of mythological images and plots in the status of a symbol or a means of narrative structuring is observed in the works.
2. Mythology in the works by I. Yuzeyev lies in the fact that he uses mythological images and plots in the text structure as a symbol to be a structure-forming component. Through the prism of mythological images and plots Y. Yuzeyev's works give a representation of general human problems, develop a new social and philosophical concept that unites the social, universal philosophy.
3. In prose works by Mirgaziyan Yunys, mythology acts as a literary means, representing a metaphorical interpretation of the author's imagination. Mythopoetic peculiarity of M. Yunys's prose lies in the fact that he uses them as the material for independent literary organization of the text, which helps him to build up an internal metaphorical content. Mythological motifs of M. Yunys are not a conscious game, the writer does not demonstrate a symbolic model of the world, his mythology is spontaneous, creative and subjective.

5 Conclusions

Thus, typologically similar to analogous phenomena in the Tatar literature of the first half of the twentieth century, mythology in the Tatar literature of the 1960s-1980s has its own distinctive features due to the impact of socio-philosophical and literary-aesthetic innovations.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

Literature:

1. Metelnsky E. M. (1976). *The Poetics of Myth*. M., 235 p.
2. Shelogurova G. (1986). *Towards Interpretation of Myth in the Literature of Russian Symbolism, From the History of Russian Realism of the End of 19th – the beginning of 20th centuries*. M.: Moscow University Press, pp. 159-171.

3. Sayfulina F.S., Karabulatova I.S., (2014). European studies of barabin tatar folklore: the role of investigations of the german scientist V.V. Radlov, *Life Science Journal*, 11(9s), pp.116-119.
4. Motigullina A., Golikova G., Zamalieva L., Shamsutdinov R. (2016). Linguistic and semantic aspects of realization of the concept «bird» in narrative by V.I. Belov “Starling” and novella by M.S. Magdeev “Where the cranes build their nests, *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, No.4, pp. 48-53.
5. Kajumova Z.M., Galiullina G.R., Yusupov A.F., Sibgatullina A.T. (2017). The Anthroponymicon of Small Genres of Tatar Folklore in the Context of the Sufi Picture of the World, *Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences*, 9(7S), pp. 1148-1156.
6. Zakirzyanov A.M., Ghilazov T.Sh. (2016). TufanMinullin drama: the synthesis of Eastern and Western traditions, *MII-MII(-SP) - Man In India*, 569062.
7. Robert A. (1999). *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University, p. 377.
8. Abrams M.H., Harpham G.G. (2009). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Printed in the United States of America, p. 393.
9. Ibragimov M.I. (2003). *Myth in Tatar Literature of the 20th Century: The Problems of Poetics*. Kazan: Gumanitaria, p. 62.
10. Gunter Kh. (2000). *Archetypes of the Soviet Culture, Social Realistic Canon*. SP.: Academic Project, pp. 743-785.
11. Yuzeyev I. (1985). *Meeting with Eternity*, Kazan: Tatar Book Publisher, p. 255.
12. Villalobos Antúnez J.V., Bozo F. (2010). El discurso jurídico y la tesis de indeterminación del derecho de Jürgen Habermas, *Frónesis*, 17(3), pp. 379-397.
13. Mobbalegh Naseri M.R., Milani A., Aghae M. (2018). Comparative analysis of crimes against domestic and foreign security in the military penal code and other criminal laws, *Astra Salvensis, Supplement No. 1*, pp. 85-95.