

DIALOGUE AND COMMUNICATION IN INTERLITERARY PROCESS (THE STUDY OF RUSSIAN – TATAR LITERARY INTERCONNECTIONS OF THE FIRST HALF OF THE XX CENTURY)

Marsel' Ibragimov*, Elvira Nagumanova, Alsu Khabibullina, Oksana Amurskaya

Kazan Federal University, Kremlevskaya str.18, Kazan (RUSSIA)

E-mails: mibragimov1000@mail.ru, ehviran@yandex.ru, alsu_zarifovna@mail.ru, oksana.amurskaya@yandex.ru

*Corresponding author: Russia@prescopus.com

DOI: 10.7813/jil.2015/6-3/31

Received: 02 Jun, 2015

Accepted: 21 Jul, 2015

ABSTRACT

The paper deals with the problem of literary interconnections in Tatar and Russian. The notions of dialogue and communication are regarded as two types of literary interconnections.

The diachronic studies of the poetical translations of Russian classics encompass a wide variety of approaches. The dialogical approach to the translations dated back to the beginning of the XX century can be traced in the free attitude of Tatar poets to the translated texts. The strategy of the accurate translation was developed in the frames of the communicative approach in 1930s.

The approaches mentioned above are revealed in the critical articles, which, dealing with the problem of literary interconnections in Tatar and Russian, estimate the correlations between the oeuvre of Russian and Tatar writers in a variety of ways.

G.Kutuy's critical articles clearly demonstrate the dialogical and communicative approaches. The dialogical interpretation of literary interconnections is based on the idea of equality in national literatures.

Key words: dialogue, communication, Russian literature, Tatar literature, translation, interliterary process

1. INTRODUCTION

Regarding globalization, modern comparative studies are concerned with the development of the new interliterary approaches. This process has sufficient impact on the interconnection between national literatures. Scholars tend to address the theory of communication as the relevant postintentional period in the history of the world literature, especially in transcultural conditions, when the main notions of comparative linguistics, such as "national literature" become theoretically and methodologically irrelevant (Gnisci, 2002, Corti, 2000, Vasilyev, 2003).

In the reflections of modern scholars particular attention is paid to the problem of correlation of the notions "dialogue" and "communication". This point of view was particularly supported by a Russian philosopher A.V.Nazarchuk, who stresses that "the different ways of the development of the philosophical idea of communication have caused the enormous gap between the dialogical tradition and the communicative theory (Nasarchuk, 2010). According to A.Nazarchuk, "the philosophy of a dialogue is inspired by a living philosophical tradition; its ideas are rooted in existentialism, ontology, hermeneutics and religious experience. A dialogue includes the concepts of bidirectionality, mutual communication: the presence of response and responsibility. Apart from the linear communicative pattern it presupposes the equality of partners, the capability to sacrifice a part of one's freedom and independence to others, the ability to share one's completeness and self sufficiency" (Nasarchuk, 2010).

Y.Safiullin supports this view on communication, opposing the latter, monological in its nature to a dialogue: "A dialogue involves the acceptance of a partner (who is different) and their shared common way to knowledge and sense, which will not necessarily result in the speakers' agreement" (Safiullin, 2012: 15-31).

The views mentioned above refer us to the dialogue theory of M.Bakhtin who interpreted a piece of art as "a dialogue of agreement", that "always combines different voices" (Bakhtin, 1996).

2. RESEARCH

The Tatar literature of the XX century was dialogically adopting fiction practices of the Russian literature of the XIX-XX centuries (Amineva, 2010; Amineva, Ibragimov, 2015). In the same period of time, 1930-1950s, the communication occupied a significant position in the literary interconnections between Tatar and Russian. It was based on the social realistic canon, which unified national literatures.

The canon contributed to the formation of not only universals in fiction (common themes, images, patterns), but also determined the rules regulating the interliterary process, which leveled the identities of national literatures as equal participants in a dialogue with the Russian literature.

For example, in Tatar criticism intention has become fundamental, the creative works of the Tatar writers are regarded as derivational from the ones of the Russian classical writers (A.Pushkin, M.Lermontov, N.Nekrasov). It is worth pointing out that such intentions are deeply rooted in sociology and lack the aesthetical analysis of literary interconnections.

The literary reputation of G.Tukay can be referred to illustrating the above mentioned sociological approach to Russian-Tatar literary interconnections, in which M.Bakhtin's dialogue of agreement" is replaced by one-sided communication. As M.Friedrich states, "from 1935 to 1970s, apart from the 1910s, the articles and the monographs devoted to this problem were politically and ideologically-oriented and single aimed. Their task was to demonstrate the connection between Gabdulla Tukay and the prominent Russian men of letters, respected by the party. Tukay was not Russian thus his part seemed to be clear: being a bright student of Russian teachers he contributed to the development of a great Russian culture in the Tatar-speaking environment..." (Friedrich, 2011).

It seems essential to emphasize that as far back as at the end of 1920s Tatar writers and critics raised the question of the influence of Russian literature on Tukay's oeuvre from a different angle, emphasizing the personal, individual origin of the attitude of G.Tukay as well as other Tatar writers to the oeuvre of Russian classics (Amineva, Ibragimov, 2015). Thus a prominent Tatar poet G.Kutuy in the article "The influence of Russian literature on G.Tukay" distinguishes several forms of literary interconnections: taklid (imitation), yzláštery (adoption), faydalanu (usage) and determines their display in Tukay's poetry.

G.Kutuy distinguishes the so called "cross-currents" in Tukay's oeuvre, which from his point of view determined the form and the meaning of the dialogue of a Tatar poet with Russian classical writers. Kutuy emphasizes that "Tukay did not imitate any Russian writer. He must have selected the congenial elements that impressed him, responded his soul, his inner world, Tatar traditions. Having selected what appealed to him, he created his own world" (Kutuy, 1928).

In the 1930s G.Kutuy changes his estimation of G.Tukay's attitude to Russian literature in his articles. The articles of that period are based on the ideological concepts, performing the part of communicative elements. As Kutuy points out in one of the articles devoted to M.Lermontov's oeuvre, "Lermontov's oeuvre is a reflection of his deepest thoughts and the affectionate feelings of Russian people. He is close to Pushkin, Shevchenko, Tukay in his profound research of folk literature<...> His [Lermontov's] literary works being penetrated with patriotic feelings, are considered to be masterpieces of the USSR folk cultural fund, alongside with the works of Pushkin, Gogol, Nekrasov, Chernyshevsky, Gogol, Tolstoy, Gorky, Shevchenko, Tukay" (Kutuy, 1939, 1).

Here we can observe the phenomenon of literature leveling, a vital feature of the time: being based on the ideological communicative units, such as "patriotism" and "nationalism", it equals the writers who apply different creative methods just as well as representatives of different national literatures (Shevchenko, Tukay).

Alongside with it in the frames of the communicative paradigm, which was levelling national literatures, we can name several works, aimed at overcoming the communicative approach to the relations between Tatar and Russian literatures.

In the same 1939 the article "Lermontov häm tatar shagyrläre" ("Lermontov and Tatar poets") by G.Kutuy is published in the newspaper «Kyzyl Tatarstan». The article possesses a number of interesting comparisons of the poems by Lermontov and Tatar poets.

In particular, Kutuy reveals the typological similarity between Lermontov's poem "My Demon" and the lyrical work by S.Ramiev "Min" ("Me"), the latter marked in pre-revolutional Tatar critics as a rebel. According to G.Kutuy, "Individualist shagyjr' Sägit Rämii Lermontovny yzenchä anlyj, älbättä. Läkin ul Lermontovnyj talanty aldynda bash iya, any ukyj, khätta anyj bemicäh shigyren tatarchaga da täřžemä itä" ("The poet-individualist Sagit Ramiev definitely interprets Lermontov in his own way. But nevertheless he worships his talent, he is familiar with his works and has even translated several of Lermontov's poems into Tatar") (Kutuy, 1939, 2).

Kutuy also pays particular attention to the problem of comparison of some single poems by Lermontov and Tatar poets. Drawing our attention to the similarity between the poem "Parus" by Lermontov and Dardmend's poems "Karab" ("Ship") and "Belly" ("Lullaby") the critic stresses not only the imagery and the emotional tonality of the compared poems, but their rhythm as well.

The analysis of the critical articles by Kutuy reveals the existence of two approaches to the interpretation of the correlations between Tatar and Russian literatures. The first one is based on the idea of the dialogical interpretation of Russian classics by Tatar writers. The second one represents their correlation as one-sided process, resulted in the assimilation of the "progressive" Russian literature by Tatar poets.

Two kinds of literary interconnections are revealed in the field of fiction translation. In the pre-revolutionary period the genre of free imitative translation, dating back to the Eastern poetry "nazir", predominated in the works of Tatar poets (Tukay, Ramiev, Dardmend). A free translation is characterized by the dominance of the subjective source, it provides the author with the opportunity of self-expression, using the data of a foreign poet (Toper, 2000; Nagumanova, 2011).

The situation outlined above changed in 1930s. In this period of history the translations of Russian classics into Tatar are put under control, executed by the Writers' Assembly of Tataria that appointed the translators as well as to-be-translated writers (in most cases the translations of Russian classical authors were intended to coincide with memorable dates: anniversaries of birth or death). On the one hand it contributed to the formation of the Tatar translation school (many Tatar translators were qualified in Moscow) and the multiplicity of translations. On the other hand Tatar poets were restricted in their choice of translations, particularly concerning the translated works).

Alongside with that, the methodology of translation in 1930s also undergoes several changes, mentioned by G.Gachecheladze in his reference to A.Simonov's paper "Methodology of literary translation" (1934): "The main propositions were erected by Smirnov as far back as in early 1930s, we can reveal some divergences towards the simplified sociologism, being common for the literary studies of that time. A. Smirnov points out the role of fiction translation as the tool in the ideological struggle, stressing the class-divided character of such method of translation" (Gachecheladze, 1980).

In 1930s a free translation was replaced by a literary (word for word) translation. The evidence of that phenomenon is the comparison of the translations of Pushkin's poems done in the pre-revolutionary period and in the 1930s.

In the beginning of the XX century Pushkin's poems were translated by many talented Tatar poets: Tukay, Dardmend, Ramiev. Their imitative translations demonstrate a dialogical perception of the poems of Russian classics. Tatar poets develop the motives of Russian poems in their own way, creating their so-called variations (e.g. the following poems translated by G.Tukay ("When Your So Young and fairy Years" ("Shoma tormysh ..."), "Poka suprug tebya, krasavitsu mladuyu..." ("Pushkinian") by A.Pushkin, "Anxiety" ("Vægaz"), "Prophet" ("Päjämbär") by M.Lermontov.

In the beginning of 1930s the method of exact translation predominated in the translations of Russian poetry into Tatar, what was connected with the new interpretation of translation as activity.

Compared to the free translation performed by Tukay, Ramiev, Sunchalyay and other Tatar poets in the beginning of the XX century, there is a certain dependence on the translated texts. Thus "a dialogue of agreement" in such translations has different origin compared to the translations performed in the beginning of the XX century. It can be exemplified by the comparison of the following asynchronical translations of Pushkin's poem "I have outlasted all desire".

The first translation of this Russian poem was performed by Tukay in 1909, the second one was made by N.Fuat in 1936 (ascribed to the 100 centenary of Pushkin's death, widely commemorated all over the country), the third one was executed by N.Arslanov in 1949 (on the 150th anniversary of Pushkin's birth).

The differences between translations are recognizable on the structural level: both N.Fuat and N.Arslanov preserved original metrics (both the original poem and its translations consist of three alternate rhymed quatrains) whereas Tukay

translated it in couplets, having applied one of the most wide-spread Eastern forms of poetry. Tukay's translation has a larger number of verses than in Pushkin's original poem (14).

Our analysis has also revealed several differences on the semantic level. N.Fuat and N.Arslanov find the equivalent lexical units close to those used by A.Pushkin. E.g. "Ostalis' mne odni stradan'ya/ Plody serdechnoj pustoty" (And I am left with only anguish/ The fruit of emptiness at heart) // *Žimeshe bulyp moñly kырjelerne/ Kaldy žanda bary sagyshlar* (N.Fuat) // *Tik gazaplar gyna mina kaldy/ Žan bushlygy birde alamy* (N.Arslanov).

The comparative analysis of the lexical units selected by the translators draws to the conclusion, that N.Arslanov selected the lexemes emphasizing the tragic melody of the poem: *kajgylyr* (mourning); *syzlanyp* (to be hurt); *sykranyyp* (to moan).

Tukay's translation of this poem is more permissive. He preserves the original motives and images, but their position differs from the original text. Thus the motive of mourning and emptiness at heart which is in the verse of the original poem is found in the third couplet in Tukay's translation.

Thus the diachronic comparison of the translations of the poem by Pushkin "I have outlasted all desire" allowed us to reach certain conclusions about different approaches in translation: in the beginning of the XX century a Tatar poet G.Tukay changes the form of the original text, introduces new motives, amplifies the expression Pushkin's motives, whereas N.Fuat and N.Arslanov preserve the original metrics in their translations and to various extents tend to apply semantically equivalent lexical units.

3. DISCUSSION

Thus we can distinctly distinguish two main periods in Russian-Tatar literary interrelations of the first half of the XX century. In the beginning of the last century (up to 1920s) Tatar poets, critics tended to perceive the works of Russian classical writers in a dialogical manner.

Dialogism in poetic translations can be revealed in the creation of the so-called imitative works and their variations.

The critics did not only tend to estimate Russian writers, but also evaluate the importance of their works for Tatar literature, while the position of the latter was not identified as "apprenticeship".

The early 1930s are characterized by the change in evaluation of the Russian-Tatar literary interrelations, as well as the approach to the translation of Russian literature into Tatar. The interpretation of the correlations of Tatar and Russian literatures as an interliterary dialogue, which clearly reveals the true identity of the Tatar literature gives way to the one-sided model of communication, which regards the oeuvre of Tatar writes as secondary from the works by Russian classics.

Since 1930s the tradition of detailed translation has predominated in the field of fiction translation as one of the makers of the communicative model.

4. CONCLUSION

All this allows us to conclude, that dialogue and communication, being regarded as two interliterary processes, do not contradict each other historically. They alternatively predominate in different periods of the interliterary process.

According to this view, highly communicatively marked fiction systems present considerable interest. In social realism or post modernism communication influences the dialogueness, that is natural for literary interrelations. As a result a reduction of the individual origin (or national origin in the context of literary interrelations) takes place.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

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

REFERENCES

1. Amineva V (2015) Phenomenon of border in interliterary dialogues. In: Journal of language and literature. Vol. 6. No. 2, pp. 246 – 249.
2. Amineva V (2010) Types of dialogical connections between national literatures (in the literary works of the Russian writers of the second half of the XIX century and the Tatar prose writers of the first part of the XX century). Kazan: Kazan State University, 474 p.
3. Amineva V (2014) "Universal" and "unique" as the categories of comparative literature. In: Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research, Volume 20, Issue 12, pp. 2094-2098.
4. Amineva V, Ibragimov M, Nagumanova E, Khabibullina A (2015) G.Tukays poetry: the aspects of national identity. In: X^{Linguæ} European Scientific Language Journal. Volume 8. Issue 1, pp. 79 – 87.
5. Bakhtin M (1996) Collected works in seven volumes: Volume 5: the works of 1940s-1960s. Moscow: Russkiye slovari, 731 p.
6. Corti M (2000) L'Europe comme "lieu mentale" et les "mondes possible". In: Identité littéraire de l'Europe, sous la direction de M.Fumaroli, Y.Bonnefoy, H.Weinrich, M.Zink. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
7. Friedrich M (2011) Gabdulla Tukay as the object of ideological battle. Kazan: Tatar publishing House, 343 p.
8. Gachecheladze G (1980) Translation of fiction and literary interconnections. Moscow: Sovetskiy pisatel', 255 p.
9. Gnisci A (2002) Literature globale et literatures des mondes. In: Neohelicon XXIX (2). Budapest, pp. 85 – 88.
10. Kutuy G (1939, 1) Lermontov. In: Azat khatyn, № 19, pp. 8-9.
11. Kutuy G (1939, 2) Lermontov and Tatar poets. In: Kyzyl Tatarstan, October, 15, p. 4.
12. Kutuy G (1928) Rus ädäbiyatynyñ G. Tukajğa tähsire. In: Bezneñ yul, 3/4, pp. 20-22.
13. Nagumanova E (2011) The destiny of free translations of the 1930s (a case study of A.S.Pushkin's translations into Tatar). In: Vestnik of Leningrad state university named after A.S.Pushkin, Vol.1, Philology, pp. 245-249.
14. Nasarchuk A (2010) Philosophical approach to a dialogue in terms of communicative approach. In: Vestnik of Moscow State University, Volume 7 (1), Philosophy, pp. 52-72.
15. Safiullin Y (2012) Communication and literature. In: Interpersonal communication: philological aspect. Kazan: Otechestvo, pp. 15-31.
16. Toper P (2000) Translation in the system of comparative literary studies. Moscow: Naslediye, 253 p.
17. Vasilyev N (2003) Historicism and relativity of the concept "national literatures". In: Papers of the international scientific conference "Comparative literary studies", pp. 53 -59.