

## The Trail Blazing Functions of Symbols In The Modern Women's Prose

Gulnaz Glusovna Sattarova  
Flera Sagitovna Sayfulina

Kazan Federal University, 18 Kremlyovskaya Street, Kazan  
Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Tatarstan Str. 2, Kazan, 420008, Russian Federation

### Abstract.

*The relevance of the research is connected with an attempt to analyze the literary works of the representatives of modern Tatar women's prose that made themselves known at the end of the twentieth century from the position of eliciting a style forming symbols. At the turn of XX – XXI centuries the Tatar literature went through a series of changes. On the one hand, it is connected with the transfer to another level of development, on the other hand, the desire to embrace all the new by means of literature and culture. This problem is interesting in the fact that the discussion concerning possibilities of defining "women's prose" as an independent field of philology is still open. For the example of works by prosaists N. Gimatdinova and F. Bairamova, one studies the peculiarities of using symbols, reveals their sense load on canvas of literary texts. The role of symbols in women's prose is important since the authoresses uncover the characters through them. It should be noted that by using symbols, the writers show psychological insight in their works, as women's prose does not stay sidelines from the description of reality. This real picture of the world is rendered via symbols and literary means.*

**Keywords:** Tatar literature, women's prose, symbol, style of writing.

**Introduction.**

Symbol is common to refer to a variety of word picture imageries possessing great significance and exceptional power of generalization.

We treat symbol as a pictorial depiction with extended allegorical sense. This pictorial depiction serves only as a means of expression relating to known experiences, moods, ideas [Literary encyclopedia, 1925].

“Mechanism” of symbol was thoroughly exposed and described in detail by A. F. Losev: “Symbol is a weapon of cognition and remodeling of the very reality... Symbol always contains an idea which turns out to be the law of its formation... If any symbol of a thing is its sign, but again none of the sign of a thing is its symbol” [Losev 1976: 109]. One began to designate symbols as a sort of sketches that serve as symbolic representations of abstract concepts. But the basic meaning of a symbol (*Greek* *symbolon* – sign, token) is an independent visual appearance which has emotional allegorical meaning based on the similarity of life phenomena [Introduction into Study of Literature, 1988: 528p.].

Symbols are actively used in the Tatar literary works, namely in prose, to understand philosophical and esthetic interpretation of the surrounding world. The system of symbols in Tatar literature is turned towards national esthetic as the problems of the present objective reality, definitions of primary qualities of human disposition are perceived as basic concepts. The authors show relation between the generations, appeal to the past history via symbols. As D. F. Zagidullina writes, symbols help to look at the discussions that are held in modern Tatar community in a new way. The reality in the works in some respect reflect the past [Zagidullina 2003: 46-49].

Symbols in women’s prose play an important role, they fill an emotional and expressive aspect in the literary work. In revealing the main idea of a storyline of the literary work, contemporary women-writers often use symbols. There is no doubt that new wave of writers introduce new tendencies into literature, at that, adhering to the traditions of predecessors, they give special consideration to reflecting social life. [Zakirova, Gizzatullina 2008: 413]. In the works they tend to create the picture of modern times which aims to disclose present society in its relation with the past history.

**Materials And Methods .**

The materials of our investigation are literary works by the representatives of the Tatar women’s prose – Nabiri Gimatdinova and Fauziya Bairamova, that are analyzed from the position of revealing and using symbols in their literary texts and determining their function that form their style.

We have used a descriptive method – a successive description of the selected material systematizing it in accordance with an objective.

The application of comparative-contrastive method implies eliciting the common and variegated things in using symbols in the Tatar women’s prose of the end of the twentieth century.

Tatar literature in the second half of the twentieth century is featured by a renovationist character. New searching, appealing to the traditions of their literary process and experience of the world literature are characteristic of the writers. [Yusupova, 2016, Vol.12, No.1, P. 213-222]

When analyzing the works by F. Bayramova, N. Gimatdinova, it is worthy of note that these authors in their works use extensively features of symbolic images. The authors use abstract meaning of the symbols to vividly depict the people’s life.

The works by F. Bairamova are one of the interesting, peculiar phenomena in Tatar literature of the end of the twentieth century. In 1980s, in which spiritual stagnation is inherent, the works of the author are distinguished by special sincerity. She writes about human soul, the characters’ quests in intricate world. The story «Болын» (“Meadow”) is one of the first works

which has made F. Bairamova famous to reading Tatar public. One of the peculiarities of her works is gorgeousness, figurativeness, emotive nature of the language.

F. Bairamova often appeals to symbols in the analyzed narrative «БОЛЫН». The author's attention is more directed to exposing the psychological state of the heroes than describing their actions. The title of the story itself is a symbol which helps to reveal a spiritual constituent of the main character of the narrative – Alsu. The author lays emphasis on emotional purity, sincerity of the heroine who always seeks for free scope to her look. Modern society, people around are unable to understand people like her. It is convenient for them who are cruel and indifferent to everything and who are so many in this life to call those like Alsu to be “strange”.

Exposing relations between generations, the human state in modern rapidly changing world, the author also applies for symbols and finds a means of showing how life changes people. For this purpose, F. Bairamova uses the symbol of mask (“Mask”). A desire to escape from the past, her roots made the heroine of the story Raihan put on the mask. But at times, nostalgia for the years of youth that have gone never to return is capable of turning the character to her nature – and her mask has vanished from her face for a certain time, her pensive sad eyes betray her.

Binary opposition of concepts is used extensively in the story - meadow and abyss, life and death, love and hatred. Two oppositions in the work are presented as a comprehensive whole. Through these concepts the author reflects on life, philosophical meaning of life that is in every being from birth. The characters from the stories by Bairamova who live not only for their own sake are humane, sympathetic to others, they worry about people around, try to extend a helping hand. Symbols perform an important role in conveying the psychological state of the characters. A typical representative of “practical” man who is accustomed to deriving benefit from everything is Gumar, who as a certain type is revealed in characteristics of Alsu «Для них эти колокольчики – сено, вот эта белая березонька, бедная березонька моя – дрова» / For them, these bells - hay, here's this white Birch, my poor Birch - firewood ) [Bairamova 1983: 84]. The author shows different views of life of his characters and different level of their spiritual advance.

In the story “Mask” the author continues her reflections on the meaning of human life [Bairamova 1986: 110]. Here she observes a gradual process of the human regeneration who adjusting to living conditions wears “mask” – he becomes cruel and ruthless, deprived. This symbol derived by the author into strong opposition – into the title of the work – performs a function of appraising all characters of the story. Here the writer builds a conditional model of human life in particular circumstances, by means of which she shows disastrous situation of denial of everything natural [Sattarova, Gabidullina 2015: 369-371].

Explicit details used by the author exactly help divulge the reason for Rashid to put on the mask of a strong and independent man: these are jeans of her husband, putting them on, as if trying on the male role [Bayramova 1983: 113]. The trousers symbolize Zinnur's responsibility.

Next to Rashida who had to put on he mask there are the other characters, the mask for whom is a way to retain a position in society. Amina and Tazkira Sabirovna put on their masks to conceal their inaptitude to work status. And Rashit Gazizovich, quite the contrary, has to put the mask on because of the specifics of his occupation. Being responsive, he has to conseal and adapt to work. It should be noted that the author lays stress on the fact that the masks do not save the characters from themselves. The main idea of the story rendered in ideological and aesthetic message can be treated in the following way: to be happy one is to live in harmony with oneself , with soul and nature, to be honest, first and foremost, before oneself.

The works by N. Gimatdinova are also a revelation in the Tatar literature of the end of the twentieth century. She displays a complex world of the human soul, interrelations between people before the reader from story to story. Her works (first of all, narratives) are psychological to the highest degree. She uses different methods of psychological insight (inner monologues, portraits,

landscapes), and the prevailing is a synthetic principle of psychology disclosure [Sitdikova 2013: 16].

The future of man often depends on the treatment of the surrounding society of him – this is the idea of certain narratives and stories by N. Gimatdinova. A specific feature in describing the main characters of her literary works is disclosure of their nature. The central female images of the author analyzed do not bear resemblance to the others, it is their own way they take the world, they are humane and ready to give up everything for the sake of love, but having not reached happiness, these women seem to be “aliens” in modern society. Their main important qualities are their dissimilarity with other members of society, their “savageness”. They live according to the laws of nature and at the call of the heart, are ready to sacrifice everything for other people to be happy. These are the writer’s ideals. Beside the characters like them all the negative sides of modern society are exposed more distinctly. Thus, in the works by N. Gimatdinova the time frames are divided into two spans of time: the past and the present. Man’s denial of nature, life for gain – all qualities inherent in modern society show to what extent the present situation in the world catastrophic is. And it is the appeal to the past with the help of which the author proves that humanity goes along the road to nowhere.

The story “Minaret” shows the tragedy of unbelief by an example of the fortune of farm chairman Nurulla. N. Gimatdinova contrasts humane Zarifulla with hard-hearted, often openly cruel, malicious Nurulla. But Nurulla’s cruelty and dissoluteness end him up to life tragedy: he is alone at his old age, nobody inquires about his fortune. Having desire to expiate his sin, Gimatdinova’s character tries to hoist the crescent stolen by him once onto the minaret, but he does not manage to do it: the minaret comes down and the old man perishes. Nurulla’s death is symbolic: it identifies inevitability of judgement of God for his deeds [Sitdikova 2013: 18].

Many works by N. Gimatdinova end in explosion, storm, catastrophe. But at the same time it should be noted that such outcome of the plot is the symbol of the fact that there is hope to rectify misdeeds by starting from scratch, turning over a new leaf [Gabidullina, Sattarova 2015: 201-203].

### **Summary.**

The symbols in the works by N. Gimatdinova, F. Bairamova serve as the devices to convey the authors’ ideas and means to vividly disclose psychologism [Zagidullina, Zakirzyanov, Gilazov 2004: 32]. Here the symbols are inter-connecting threads of the past with the present. It helps to understand the past history, at the same time, appraise the nation’s present and future. This wave, according to D. Zagidullina, is in keeping with the tendency of neoclassicism in Russian literature.

In the works of Tatar literature there are national subjects differing from the subjects of other literatures, which determines the specific character of the plot of the texts. In the authors’ works analyzed within this study, a particular feature here is a subtle lyricism that is attended with fear, tragedy, a feeling of despair. Thus, symbols in the works by Tatar women-writers perform an important style-forming function. The use of symbols help to render philosophical, national, moral ideas. The authors consider the possibility of using symbols as a way to seek for the new. There are concealed the authors’ philosophical reflections on life sense in them. They treat the art as a means for the search for justice, implying the idea of keeping in touch with different generations. Applying composition devices, the authors use extensively the new symbols created in the text canvas and choose the eternal ones.

### **Conclusion.**

Thus, the analysis of the works studied here shows that the symbols in the women’s prose are of significant importance in revealing the main ideas of modern times.

Firstly, the symbols in the writers' works under consideration occupy a special place. The authors disclose the psychological states of the characters via symbols.

Secondly, the symbols in these works are style-forming components, they create a unique style of the representatives of the Tatar women's prose.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

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



**References**

1. Literary Encyclopedia: The Dictionary of Literary Terms: In 2 Volumes /Т Edited by N. Brodsky, A. Lavretsky, E. Lunin, V. Lvov-Rogachevsky, M. Rozanov, V. Chekhishin-Vetrinsky. — M.; JL.: L. D. Frenhel Press, 1925
2. Losev A. F. The problem of symbol and realistic art. – the second edition, revised. — M.: Art, 1995. — 320 p.
3. Introduction to literary study: Textbook for philological specialities universities / G. N. Pospelov, P. A. Nikolayev, I. F. Volkov and others; Edited by G. N. Pospelov. – the third edition, revised and enlarged. – M.: Higher school, 1988. – 528c.
4. Zagidullina D. F. Modernism and Tatar Prose of Early Twentieth Century. – Kazan: The Tatar Publishing House, 2003. – 255 p. (in Tatar)
5. Zakirova G. R., Gizzatullina L. A. Modern Tatar Literature. – Kazan: Magarif, 2008. – 455 p. (in Tatar)
6. Yusupova N. M., Sayfulina F. S. Gainullina G. R., Ibragimov B. Kh. Fiction adaptation characteristics in Tatar literature of the second half of XX century // European Journal of Science and Theology, February 2016, Vol.12, No.1, ss. 213-222. <http://www.ejst.tuiasi.ro/issue12.html>
7. Bairamova E. Meadow: a narrative // Lights of Kazan. – 1983. –№9. – P.82-126. (in Tatar)
8. Bairamova E. Meadow: a narrative [“Meadow”, “Mask”]. – Kazan: The Tatar Publishing House, 1986. – 200 p.
9. Sattarova Gulnaz G, Gabidullina Farida I. The novel's genre of the modern Tatar literature (in the example of the F. Bairamova's creation // Journal of Language and Literature, ISSN: 2078-0303, Vol. 6. No. 2. Iss.2, May, 2015, Pages 369-371
10. Sitdikova Ch. F. Principles and Means of Creating of Literary Picture of the World in prose by F. Safin and N. Gimatdinova // The author's abstract of dissertation for a degree of candidate of philology. – Kazan, 2013. – 24 p.
11. Gabidullina, F.I., Sattarova, G.G. Reflects the traditions in contemporary prose // Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences . – Volume 6, Issue 5S2, 1 September 2015, Pages 201-203
12. Zagidullina D. F., Zakizyanov A.M., Gilazov T. Sh. – Kazan: Magarif, 2004. – 247 p. (in Tatar)

**CONFLICT OF INTERESTS**

The author confirms that this article content has no conflict of interests.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

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