

EVA MNATSAKANYAN

PhD in Philology

Institute of Literature of NAS RA

MnacakanyanEva@mail.ru

THE LITERARY CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE OF TOUMANYAN'S POEM ANUSH

Key words: Hovh. Toumanyan, “Anush”, literary criticism, fine art principles, processing, evaluation, individual psychology

H. Toumanyan's role is exceptionally great in the Armenian literature, particularly in the development of the poetic genre which has been raised by the great master to a level of classical idealism. This, in fact provided a unique role for H. Toumanyan in the Armenian Literature. It is not accidental that in the early phase, when Toumanyan just started appearing in front of the reading audience his poems were always thought highly of. The famous Armenian poet Isahakyan in his letter to Toumanyan stated, “Whatever may happen, your poems have made an era in our literature¹.”

Our study is devoted to the poem “Anush”, which has been one of the immortal pieces in the Armenian Literature. The poem has always been in the center of attention of the literary critics of the time, as well as in the focus of further studies of Toumanyan's works². Our aim is to summarize the appraisals

¹ Իսահակյան Ավ., Երկերի ժողովածու՝ 6 հատորով, հ. 6, Ե., 1979, էջ 41:

² See Ինճիկյան Ա., Հովհաննես Թումանյան. կյանքի և ստեղծագործության պատմությունը (1869–1899), Ե., 1969, Ղազարյան Հովհ., «Անուշի» ստեղծագործական պատմությունը, Ե., 1975, Հախվերդյան Լ., Թումանյանի աշխարհը, Ե., 1966, Մկրյան Մ.,

The Literary Critical Perspective of Toumanyan's Poem Anush

given to the poem in the perspectives of history, analyze the basis for each point of view, and the valuable insights that served as conceptual bases for the analysis of the poem at that time. There are a great number of studies, critical papers and articles on "Anush". Hence, in this case our aim is not to reveal the amount of evaluations given to the poem, but rather present the essential characteristics and qualities which brought out the real value and uniqueness of the poem. In the light of these features, the critiques also present the existing literary trends, such as the social-political realities and controversial ideological movements, in fact reflecting, the cultural-historical, social-political, psychological tendencies of the time. After the publications of the two basic versions on both, the official criticism and friendly reading audience levels, "Anush" received a lot of controversial appraisals, which "forced the poet to make numerous changes during the years³."

It is known that the poem was first published in "Poems" second volume. In 1891, Toumanyan intended to publish the first version of "Anush" in "Murch". On March 2, 1891, he informed his friend Anushavan Abovyan about his intention and asked for his opinion, enclosing some extracts from the poem in his letter. Abovyan answered, "Getting a little imagination from your poem's extracts, I would not advise you to publish it in "Murch" or in any other magazine. I think, such a beautiful poem, which would make a luxurious ornament for your second collection of poems, will lose its value⁴, if that is the case."

In late November, 1892, the second collection, "Poems", was published in Moscow, and the reader got acquainted with the first version of "Anush", which as already revealed in the studies on Toumanyan, significantly differs from the second edited version.

In 1893, the famous writer and pedagogue Ghazaros Aghayan's small article "Tasting Hovhannes Toumanyan's "Anush" was published in the third issue of "Murch". "In recent times, in the young garden of our literature, new flowers have blossomed one after another. Nowadays, a new flower also

Հովհաննես Թումանյանի ստեղծագործությունը, Ե., 1981, **Григорян К.** Ованес Туманян, Ե., 1969, **Ջրբաշյան Է.**, Թումանյանի պոեմները, Ե., 1986:

³ The poem has appeared in additional eight publications and in a separate book, after its first (1892) and second (1903) basic versions.

⁴ **Ինճիկյան Ա.**, Հովհաննես Թումանյան, էջ 125:

blossomed, a fragrant and modest one, as a violet, rising on the banks of clear stream in Gugarkats world⁵.” This is how Gh. Aghayan starts his article. In prose and poetry lines the critic emphasizes the unbreakable ties that exist between the poet and his hometown, native country and native people. Of more than fifty works by Toumanyan, Aghayan chooses only the poem “Anush” as a target for criticism, presenting the process and logic of the characters and events. He very delicately correlates Anush (Toumanyan) with Ophelia (Shakespeare), which definitely prompts that Toumanyan with no less mastery than Shakespeare was able to depict the tragedy of woman who loses her love. In terms of historical values, Aghayan’s article does not possess deep analytical insight. It is more valuable as the first and the only printed word on *Anush* with warm and sympathetic overtones.

Instead of this, the poet gets encouraging and inspirational letters from his friends and relatives. In these letters, next to the subjective, exaggerated and sometimes even unacceptable opinions, there were also fundamental points of view which encompassed useful lessons for the young poet. For instance, Toumanyan’s friends, namely – the pedagogue and critic Grigor Vantsyan and journalist Aram Arakelyan approved of the publication of the second volume and considered the poem “Kanch” as the masterpiece of the collection. However, speaking about “Anush”, they noticed that there are delays, which were taken into account by the poet while editing the poem in the future.

Pedagogue and translator Jalal Ter-Grigoryan focuses on the advantages of the second book, writing, “Your present collection has poems woven with the national soul, which show how the artery of the nation is closely attached to your heart. This is very comprehensive and, consequently, very valuable only for the real sons of the nation⁶.” Hence, he considers unacceptable the opinions of others (he means Gr. Vantsyan and A. Arakelyan, – E. M.) with reference to the idea that Toumanyan will perhaps stop being the national poet.

After Aghayan, the only attempt of criticism on Toumanyan’s works known to us is the article by pedagogue, translator and journalist Tigran Piroumyan entitled “A Real Poet (on the new book by Mr. Hovhannes Toumanyan)”, the

⁵ Մուրճ, Թիֆլիս, 1893, թիւ 3, էջ 457:

⁶ Թումանյան Հովհ., Ուսումնասիրություններ և հրապարակումներ, հ. 4, Ե., 1994, էջ 316:

The Literary Critical Perspective of Toumanyan's Poem *Anush*

handwritten copy of which reached us in a draft version. First of all, Piroumyan stresses the unique talent of the young poet, speaking about his first collection. Addressing the second book Piroumyan writes, "We read him, and we stop at every moment because of the writer's talent, freshness of his ideas, strength of emotions, and unreachable flight of his imagination. We stop and become deeply sure that he is not only a bright star among today's numerous "poem makers", but also one of the nineteenth century famous poets of the highest class⁷." The writer has a firm belief that with some of his works Toumanyan has an absolute right to have an equal standing among such famous European poets as Byron, Schiller, Goethe, Pushkin, Lermontov. As a proof for what he said, Piroumyan speaks about "*Anush*" and gives examples of extracts. The interesting fact is that Piroumyan evaluates the poem in terms of two things: aesthetics (mastery of depicting nature and heroes' inner world) and the national content (revealing the rural life, customs and people's mentality). Piroumyan notices the "Godly temper" of the poet, calling him a "Real Poet".

In contrast to Aghayan's and Piroumyan's positive critiques, Leo, a historian, a literary critic, and a representative of cultural-historical school, in his study entitled "Eastern Armenian Literature from the Beginning up to Our Days" expresses a completely different view about "*Anush*". Thinking highly about the poetic strength and social value of the generation of such poets as Patkanyan, Nalbandyan, and Shahaziz, he considers the works of the poets of the coming generation to be very weak, similar and boring. Leo is sure that the contemporary poet, singing only of love, spring and sadness, is not in touch with the social mood of the people.

Naming Hovhannes Toumanyan "Singer of Mountain", he writes that the poetic "creative strength" of the latter faded after his second book of poems. "Since then, Mr. Toumanyan has remained still, he doesn't go ahead⁸." Leo tries to justify this one-sided opinion with his unusual logic: born in the mountains, inspired by the beauty of the nature, the poet has written "sweet" songs as long as he has been tied to his birthplace and native people. However, the city life has decreased his talent.

⁷ See **Ինճիկյան Ա.**, Հովհաննես Թումանյան. կյանքի և ստեղծագործության պատմությունը (1869–1899), Ե., 1969, p. 329.

⁸ Գեղունի, հ. 1–10, Վենետիկ, 1903, էջ 62:

Further insights of the critic not only contradict one another, but also sometimes reflect stressed out tendencies. Sometimes he confirms that Toumanyanyan is a talent and “The Dog and Cat”, “Goutan Song”, “Akhtamar” are pearls that are unsurpassable in terms of scenery descriptions. However, sometimes he notes that Toumanyanyan “is one-sided and limited”. “But a human being, a human, this is where Toumanyanyan doesn’t succeed,” the critic insists assuredly. “In the description of the mountains, every high flight, every exaggerated coloring is forgivable, as nature is even higher, mystical, fascinating. But here come people and Mr. Toumanyanyan describes them in the same way as mountains: everywhere they are giants, everywhere titans, there are no common people⁹.”

This last remark addresses the basic aesthetics of Toumanyanyan’s works: Why are his heroes giants and titans? Why do “common” people have a real exceptional aesthetic weight in his creative world? These are the major questions that even today do not receive the deserved attention by scholars. But this was the uniqueness of Toumanyanyan’s poetic thinking. This was also the basic ingredient for his creative methodology that couldn’t be totally integrated into any method known in theory. In the literary studies it has been noticed that he wove the poetic epic of his country and nation. Being common people, his heroes get extraordinary qualities in his epic system. Leo couldn’t comprehend this uniqueness of Toumanyanyan’s creative description. He writes about Toumanyanyan and his heroes’ world, that these heroes are just giants “reaching nonsense”, not simple people, and their surrounding is not adequate to their heroic character.

To provide basis for this opinion, Leo speaks about “*Anush*”. The critic’s idea is a surprise: he considers the development of the plotline Saro –Anush – Mosi on the basis of the poem as a simple story, for the depiction of which there was no need to use “sky scratching mountains” and long descriptions of village life. Indeed, we shouldn’t forget that the old version of the poem was at the target of this criticism, and most possibly Leo was not aware of the new one. This doesn’t mean that the poem has no literary value, about what the critic remains silent. However, it is worth mentioning that the long descriptions of nature, indeed, weakened the ideal fictional structure of the poem. In the first

⁹ Ibid.

The Literary Critical Perspective of Toumanyan's Poem *Anush*

version, this gap was noticed by others and the writer has undoubtedly taken into account all these remarks when working on the last version.

Toumanyan's second collection, more specifically the poem "*Anush*" has been addressed on various occasions as well as in future. For instance, in 1910, philologist and pedagogue Grigor Balasanyan writes about the collection in the magazine "*Handes Amsorya*" (Issue N 3). It is worth mentioning that the author of the article speaks only about "*Anush*". The reader feels Balasanyan's evaluative approach when he describes the development of events. Without a serious analysis, he confirms that "*Anush*" is the masterpiece of Toumanyan's works by retelling it and providing rich citations. "Through the poetic flights and rich imagery he takes you to his native nature. This, I believe, is enough, to show Toumanyan's talent, poetic ability and taste. "*Anush*" has psychology and fiction tenderness¹⁰."

The second, basically reworked version was published one decade later, in 1903, in his third collection "Poems". For the first time we learn about the reworked version from Jalal Ter-Grigoryan's letter, where the latter writes, "I am looking forward not only to the reworked version of "*Anush*" but also to your other unpublished poems¹¹." Then until 1903 we do not see any remark on the poem. In his letters to Pilippos Vardazaryan (1902) Toumanyan speaks about "*Anush*" in terms of his philosophical, creative enthusiasm and self-critical thoughts. On October 4, 1902, Av. Isahakyan writes to Toumanyan, "Darling, what are you doing, where is your "*Anush*"? I go on dreaming about it. When you read it in winter, I was fascinated. Hurry up, publish it, so that we can see and enjoy it fully¹²."

Thus, even in the phase of rework, "*Anush*" fascinated Av. Isahakyan and got his unique appraisal. The reflections on the third collection were not delayed. On January 16, 1904 Leo's critique was published in "Mshak" N 2. The critic is of the same opinion that he had in the near past: the analysis and theoretical generalizations are done based on the same value system. According to him, as a village man Toumanyan could initially weave songs and poems by

¹⁰ «Հանդէս ամսօրեայ», N 3, Վիեննա, էջ 72:

¹¹ **Ինճիկյան Ա.**, Հովի. Թումանյանի կյանքի և ստեղծագործության տարեգրություն (1869–1908), էջ 293:

¹² **Իսահակյան Ավ.**, Երկերի ժողովածու, հ. 6, էջ 42:

using bright colors and impressions from the nature. “These are external ornaments,” writes Leo and almost immediately adds the controversy “But the poet stays one-sided and simple in terms of context and singing about the mountains¹³.” In the critic’s opinion, “the poet who is singing mountains”, has not become “mature” in terms of context. Moreover, he goes on insisting that after writing “*Anush*” and “*Maro*” Toumanyanyan has not taken a step forward. Here, again, Leo’s unacceptable approach is surprising. The critic totally neglects the valuable work, which was totally different from the previous one. If he were just, he would have at least noticed, that while working on the poem, the writer took into account his remarks as well: the long description of nature and daily life.

In contrast to Leo’s article, writer and social-political activist Av. Aharaonyan, writes a long article in N 1 issue of “Murch”, addressing both the advantages and the shortcomings of the poem. Aharonyan starts the appraisal of “*Anush*” with the opinion that nobody dared to speak about the Armenian village in the Armenian poetry, “where the century long life has created stereotypes which are rich, multicontext and interesting¹⁴.”

It’s worth recalling that one of the basic recommendations of Leo about Toumanyanyan’s works was that the poet was not able to create human stereotypes. On the contrary, as Aharonyan affirms it is Toumanyanyan who masterly uncovers the beautiful and light, dark and closed corners of the Armenian village life, gets into the inner world of the people filled with hatred and love, gives the beautiful image of the nature and enhances the indivisible ties between humans and nature. “And in all this you feel the wild breath of the nature, you feel that a human always speaks, cries, laughs in the language of trees, flowers, grass, rocks and gorges. You feel that human is united with nature. They have one soul, one breath, one giggle, one love and one hatred¹⁵”. These insights by Aharonyan have been developed and deepened in different cases and in different lights by literary scholars and continue to be topical in contemporary Toumanyanyan studies.

¹³ **Լեո**, Մատենագրություն. Հ. Թումանյան «Բանաստեղծություններ», Մշակ, Թիֆլիս, թիվ 2, 1904:

¹⁴ **Ահարոնյան Ավ.**, Հ. Թումանյան՝ «Բանաստեղծություններ», Մուրճ, 1904, թիվ 1, էջ 175:

¹⁵ Ibid, pp. 175–176.

The Literary Critical Perspective of Toumanyán's Poem Anush

Speaking about the main heroes of the poem Anush and Saro, Aharonyan does not carry out a detailed psychological analysis, but retells scenes of the plot very impressively. Using citations from the original, he is able to persuade that Toumanyán has profound knowledge of the environment he represents and has a deep understanding of the people's inner world, living in that particular environment. This, as concluded by the critic, enables the poet to create heroes that embody not only local-national values, but also universal human values at large.

The critic can feel the harmony of sounds in the whole poem, which becoming music, is heard in every line. Giving the example from the last scene of the poem with the cry of Anush, Aharonyan makes interacting recommendations about it, "As all our folk songs, this sorrow of Anush, a tiny part of which is only shown here, possesses obvious harmony, very successful arrangement of words, the reading of which gives one even an impression of a song¹⁶".

It is not accidental that this part of the poem appears fully in A. Tigranyan's opera and attracts the audience up to now, even those of other nationalities. Speaking about the role of poetry in music and music in poetry in his study "Toumanyán's Anush", the Doctor of Musical Arts from New York City University Beata Navratil writes that "Toumanyán's poetry falls into musical settings, and the sheer volume of musical compositions written in Toumanyán's words attests to this. The poem *"Anush"* offers a perfect opportunity to explore the melody of Toumanyán's soul, discover the hidden musical world behind his work, and view him as a worthy son pursuing the great traditions of Armenian poets, whose works connect poetry and music just like those of G. Narekatsi and Sayat Nova¹⁷."

Summing up his critique, Aharonyan writes about Toumanyán's art with obvious fascination, "One needs to read the whole piece, see the whole of the Armenian village full of happiness and sorrow, tears and laughter, to be sure that *"Anush"* is a gem in our fiction literature¹⁸."

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 181.

¹⁷ Navratil B., Music in Poetry and Poetry in Music: Hovhannes Toumanyán, New York, 2015, pp. 5–6.

¹⁸ Ահարոնյան Ավ., Հ. Թումանյան՝ «Բանաստեղծություններ», էջ 182:

The literary critic of “Bazmavep” Mkrtich Poturyan considers “*Maro*”, “*Anush*”, “*Loretsi Sako*” as “National poems”, that is, they are directed towards “hick” audience. It is certain that Poturyan evaluated Toumanyanyan’s best poems with upper and lower criteria that are widely accepted in the estimation of classical literature. The attitude to these poems was also due to their poetic form which according to the critique, is inadequate for the historical character of poetic works.

One of the attempts to criticize Toumanyanyan’s works was the cultural activist and publisher Pilipos Vardazaryan’s small book “The Singer of Sorrow and Sadness Hovhannes Toumanyanyan” where the author tries to reveal the poet’s world of feelings. “*Anush*” is considered to be a dramatic scene because of the folk life, where the reason of the tragedy is a custom. Vardazaryan particularly stresses out the idea that the poet presents the nature of Lori and the life of its inhabitants by intentionally taking a neutral side and never expressing his attitude. This is considered to be the essential characteristic feature of his creativity. Presenting the poem’s plot, Vardazaryan concludes, “In “*Anush*” the poet didn’t do anything artificial. He stayed aloof, neutral, objective, showing neither his sympathy nor antipathy¹⁹.”

Leo has also accused Toumanyanyan of “indifferently watching” his heroes, but if Leo, who understood Toumanyanyan’s poetic language very well represented the issue in order to reduce the writer’s reputation in the eyes of the audience, Vardazaryan simply does not notice the delicate intertwinement of Toumanyanyan’s images, neither does he understand that the poet himself has lived the sorrow of his heroes in advance. Otherwise stated, the reader and the critic Vardazaryan would understand the events in the poem as a common story but not a highly valuable piece of poetry. Vardazaryan does not understand that the night fairies that mourn for the “young lover”, the girls astonished by the lot and the fate of Anush, the mourning women next to Saro’s body, the grievous sounds from the mourning river, the whisper of the trees and flowers smelling laden, and everything and everyone that were born from the poet’s soul and share his breath, express the sorrow accumulated in the poet’s heart.

¹⁹ Վարդազարյան Փ., Վշտի ու թախծի երգիչ Հովհաննես Թումանյան, Թիֆլիս, 1905, էջ 13:

The Literary Critical Perspective of Toumanyan's Poem *Anush*

In his work "The History of the Eastern Armenian Literature", writer, pedagogue, literary historian Levon Manvelyan evaluates "*Anush*" as Toumanyan's masterpiece. Like the previous critics, Manvelyan also starts his words with the plot of the poem. Then, without the heroes' psychological moves, analysis of their relationships, and revealing of the connections between human beings and nature, Manvelyan concludes "*Anush*" represents a fictional unity. It is also beautiful in its details. The first meeting of the lovers in the gorge, near the spring is described with mastery. And the nature is miraculous in poet's descriptions. The moral of the poem is encompassed in the force of love. Of course, it is an old topic. But Toumanyan's talent is seen in his ability to embody this idea in two beautiful souls. The folks are also very successful and possess all the peculiarities of mountain people²⁰.

As can be noticed, "*Anush*" is evaluated from different angles, which are sometimes controversial, and sometimes even coincidental with the evaluation criteria of some literary movements. A follower of the historical-sociological direction Hovakim Solovyan considers usefulness as the most important criterion of art evaluation. According to it, the priorities of community development are connected with the struggle of proletarians. Thus, literary works that are not the expression of that struggle are limited and outdated. In this respect, Solovyan considers Toumanyan's motives of lyrics as "late tunes", and the poet as somebody, who is inspired by the pieces of the past and is a foreigner-writer in the present life. The poem "*Anush*" is considered as unique in its type and Solovyan does not find any work equal to it. However, here the criterion for evaluation is again the Marxist theory of sociological equivalence of art: the poem is distinguished as Toumanyan represents here the familiar image of the native village, customs, environment and people. "This work of Toumanyan, does not have any connection with the fantastic material customary to poems and the work makes an impression of seeing the reality in the village with our own eyes, specifically the people cut from the village life. We may be surprised at the vulgar customs of the village, morals, understanding. However, it is the result of our century-old views. It is allowed to love only in case when the tribal moral of the community is not breached. This is addressed in "*Anush*". Under Toumanyan's pen, the symmetry and form are beautifully followed, and the

²⁰ Մանվելյան Լ., Ռուսահայ գրականության պատմություն Դ, Թիֆլիս, 1911, էջ 83-84:

poem ends with a heart-breaking drama²¹.” With this, the “evaluation” of “*Anush*” is finished as according to the critic, the poem is cut from the real life and “the core needs of the world”. “And the village, does it give now only “wrestling” and “wedding feast” which are only the remnants of a medieval life, that as mentioned above, only the cult brings to light, idolizing them²²?”

For Solovyan, the love story of Anush and Saro is summarized in “narrow understandings of family”, while the poet should be led by the requirement of time and life. Solovyan reminds about the principle of French sociologist G. Tard, according to whom, fine art should have distinct historical aims which should change when transforming from one social state into another.

Despite its depth and beauty, the poem “*Anush*” was not accepted by Poghos Makintseyan, a critic, historian and state activist. In 1912, his two-part article devoted to Hovhannes Toumanyanyan and Avetik Isahakyan was published in “*Garoun*” collection, book three. The critic studies Toumanyanyan’s works in the context of time, social-political, and historical relationships at the same time trying to allocate it in the field of the New Armenian Literature. Carrying out a detailed study of Toumanyanyan’s works, Makintseyan expresses various, even controversial ideas, which were revealed by those studying Toumanyanyan’s works. Quite justly, literary critic Hrant Tamrazyan considers Makintseyan’s opinion mistaken saying that, “Every art critic has his/ her interest focused on either a person or events²³.” This is a surprising division, which contradicts the criteria of fine arts even in terms of simple logic. Giving an obvious advantage to the appearance of national poem by Toumanyanyan, masterful description of Armenian village life, unique description of nature and scenery, the author of the article hastens to notice that Toumanyanyan did not intend to create characters. He is mostly interested in events. “The brighter and more vivid is the image of village life, the paler and more incomplete are the portraits of the villagers. A luxurious frame for pale faces²⁴.” This approach of Makintseyan is justly considered wrong by literary critic E. Jrbashyan in terms of principles and theory. “In literature, as in “Human Science”, the nature cannot be separated from a human being and

²¹ Սողովյան Հ., Քննադատական տեսություններ. ժամանակակից հայ քնարերգության փիլիսոփայությունը, հ. Ա, Թիֆլիս, 1911, էջ 46–47:

²² Ibid, p. 49.

²³ «Գարուն» ամսնախ, գրական-քննադատական գիրք 3, Մոսկվա, 1912, էջ 254:

²⁴ Ibid, p. 260.

The Literary Critical Perspective of Toumanyan's Poem Anush

opposed to him/her, understood and depicted independent of humanity. It should always carry human character; otherwise it is dead and meaningless. The scenery of mountainous nature here serves the expression of human essence and forces. And the ideal consists only in the harmony between a human being and the nature²⁵.”

Makintyan insists several times that Toumanyan has a very little consideration for human feelings, human character and the human being as a carrier of individual psyche, as individuality is totally absent in his works. A human has a secondary role in Toumanyan's works: a human is just a means to describe the events in a lively manner²⁶.

Indeed this approach is completely wrong. One of the expressions of Toumanyan's talent is that the poet always keeps sensory world of his heroes and its unseen sides in the center of attention. One of Toumanyan's artistic objectives is to reveal the beauty of the person- individual's soul, which very often stays out of attention and remains unnoticed.

Speaking about the poem “*Anush*”, the critic has a more acceptable approach, considering the heroes as more “live faces”. He considers the madness of Anush much more natural than that of Sako's. However, he repeats that “the village atmosphere and not the villagers is what gives life to the poem and is the force and ornament of the poem²⁷.” Makintyan unfortunately ignores the tender and unseen stimuli, with which the poet breathes life and artistically distinguishes the characters of the poem. And not only this; the folk environment with its wide epical and daily life display is organically united with the heroes' psychological transformations and is generated as a harmonious world of human relationships, possessing both characteristics: poetic and real.

The historian and Marxist critic Davit Ananun represents another standpoint in his study entitled “The Honoring of the Pat” included in “Garun” collection, which gives room for numerous debates and reactions. The basis of the article is that Toumanyan is a “poet of Armenian peculiarity”, who has always honored the so called “young age” of the folks. Ananun thinks highly of Toumanyan's masterful depiction of village life. The critic ignores the

²⁵ Զրբաշյան Է., op. cit., pp. 92–93.

²⁶ «Գարուն» ամսանախ, գրական-քննադատական գիրք 3, էջ 254–255:

²⁷ Ibid, p. 263.

psychology of people, which is seemingly simple, yet full of unwritten rules. Ananun writes, “He doesn’t know the reasons of natural phenomena, as he is in the simplest relationship with the nature. If the influence on nature is also the influence of people, then it should be said, that the shepherd people, and even the simple farmer change very little in nature. They lead a plain life, their thoughts are far from complex experiments and stay unripe and instead of natural, they develop supernatural. The culture of mountainous people, thus, is a low culture, and its peculiarities are a result of isolated unripe life²⁸.” So, according to Ananun, people living in the mountains cannot “have requirements of rich thinking and complex anger”. This is the criterion that Ananun uses to evaluate “*Anush*”. He pays particular attention to Toumanyanyan’s language and style, and some fine art pieces which fascinate the reader with their artistic flexibility. However, here he does not see the real feelings of people, psychology and individual tragedy either.

Another critic focuses only on the inner layers of the poet’s psychology. In his work “The Lyricist of the Native Land” a representative of psychological school Arsen Terteryan focuses on the controversy and interconnection between the social customs and individual’s world of emotions. In contrast to the one-sided approaches and opinions of the previous critics, Terteryan puts forward the basis for the principles of scientific analysis. He focuses on the logical connections in the inner psychological developments of Toumanyanyan’s heroes and their life bases. He notices the split of people between the pressing chains of traditions and free flight of love. Terteryan writes, “When the lover Saro wrestles with his friend, he becomes the slave of custom for some time, he doesn’t want to fail his competitor. However, when his eyes come to his love, he forgets all the conditions and customs and also the fact, that Anush’s brother is in front of him, and he wins over him. Everything should be forgiven for the sake of love²⁹.”

Focusing on some basic questions, Terteryan, however, doesn’t discuss the poem as a whole system. E. Jrbashyan is just, when he writes that, “Terteryan usually discusses the poem not as a whole with all its components, rather only

²⁸ Ibid, p. 122.

²⁹ Տերտերյան Ա., Երկեր, Ե., 1980, էջ 92–93:

The Literary Critical Perspective of Toumanyan's Poem Anush

one or two characters, with their social psychological content³⁰.” In fact, Terteryan’s method of analyzing the character remains unique in the Armenian reality: he surrounds himself with “similar-fate” main heroes and considering them as “general fiction type”, carries out analysis and generalization of their inner life. For example, Anush, Tamar (“Akhtamar”), then Parvana princess (“Parvana”) are united as characters, carrying the ideas of love and immortality. However, the psychologically deep and tender layers of Anush are presented in a new light, and this speaks about Toumanyan’s talent in controversy to another opinion of the time, that is the poet’s heroes do not possess psychological inner world.

There were numerous critiques and opinions about “*Anush*”, and consequently it is not only impossible but also unnecessary to address each of them. It is not our aim to sum up all the opinions about the poem. The most important aim here is to highlight the fundamentals of different methodological directions and worldviews, as well as notice the rational solutions and descriptions which later largely promoted the development of the studies on Toumanyan’s life and work.

To sum up, irrespective of controversial and sometimes even surface level opinions about “*Anush*”, the poem has been rather highly valued in the lifetime of Toumanyan. In each of these opinions there were outlines raising the values of the poem, which later promoted the development of studies on Toumanyan’s life and work in various magnitudes.

ՀՈՎՀ. ԹՈՒՄԱՆՅԱՆԻ «ԱՆՈՒՇ» ՊՈԵՄԸ ԺԱՄԱՆԱԿԱԿԻՑՆԵՐԻ ԳՐԱՔՆՆԱԴԱՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԳՆԱՀԱՏՄԱՄԲ

ՄՆԱՅԱԿԱՆՅԱՆ Ե.

Ամփոփում

Քանալի բառեր՝ Հովհ. Թումանյան, «Անուշ», գրաքննադատություն, գեղագիտական սկզբունքներ, վերամշակում, գնահատում, անհատական հոգեբանություն:

³⁰ Հայ նոր գրականության պատմություն, հ. 5, Ե., 1979, էջ 180:

Հոդվածը ներկայացնում է ժամանակի գրաքննադատության՝ Հովհ. Թումանյանի «Անուշ» պոեմին տված գնահատականները, որոնք որոշակիորեն բացահայտում են ոչ միայն մեծ բանաստեղծի գեղագիտական սկզբունքներն ու մտածողությունը, այլև ժամանակի գրական-քննադատական մտքի (Լեո, Ավ. Ահարոնյան, Տ. Փիրումյան, Գ. Բալասանյան, Պ. Մակինցյան, Դ. Անանուն, Ա. Տերտերյան և այլք) զարգացման միտումները:

«Անուշին» վերաբերող ուսումնասիրությունները, գրախոսություններն ու հոդվածները բավական շատ են, ուստի հոդվածի նպատակն է բացահայտել պոեմին տրված այն էական բնութագրումներն ու հատկանիշները, որոնք բացել են պոեմի իրական արժեքն ու եզակիությունը: Չնայած հնչած կարծիքները երբեմն աչքի են ընկել միակողմանիությամբ, հակասականությամբ, այնուամենայնիվ Հ. Թումանյանի «Անուշ» պոեմը իր ժամանակին ընդհանուր առմամբ բավական բարձր է գնահատվել: Արտահայտված տեսակետներից յուրաքանչյուրում կային պոեմի արժանիքները վեր հանող ուրվագծեր, որոնք հետագայում մեծ կամ փոքր չափով խթանեցին թումանյանագիտության զարգացումը:

ПОЭМА ОВ. ТУМАНЯНА «АНУШ» В ЛИТЕРАТУРНО-КРИТИЧЕСКОЙ ОЦЕНКЕ СОВРЕМЕННИКОВ

МНАЦАКАНЯН Е.

Резюме

Ключевые слова: Ов. Туманян, “Ануш”, литературная критика, эстетические принципы, обработка, оценка, индивидуальная психология.

Литературно-критическая оценка творчества Туманяна, в частности, его поэмы «Ануш» выявляет тенденции развития литературно-критической мысли того периода (Лео, Ав. Агаронян, Т. Пирумян, Г. Баласанян, П. Макинцян, Д. Ананун, А. Тертерян и др.).

Хотя и о поэме «Ануш» высказывались весьма противоречивые мнения, носившие порой односторонний характер, но в целом поэма получила довольно высокую оценку современников.