

THE RECEPTION OF HOMER'S ILIAD IN THE PERIOD OF THE BULGARIAN REVIVAL RECEPCIA HOMÉROVEJ ILIADY V OBDOBÍ BULHARSKÉHO NÁRODNÉHO OBRODENIA

Andriana Spassova

Department of Bulgarian Renaissance Literature, Institute for Literature in Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria

Bulgarian Revival literature, 4th year, regular training of PhD
andriana.spassova@gmail.com

Supervisor: **prof. Rumyana Damyanova, DSc. (damianova3@abv.bg)**

Keywords

Bulgarian Revival, Homer's reception, literary criticism, popular textbook literature, Bulgarisation (adaptation), enlightenment purposes, scientific reflection

Kľúčové slová

bulharské národné obrodenie, recepcia Homéra, literárna kritika, populárne učebnice literatúry, bulharizácia (adaptácia), osvietenstvo, vedecká reflexia

The statement *critical disagreement* highlights the dual location of the Revival debate of the 70s of the XIXth century about classical education. The new type of readership builds up from the self-knowledge of the new type of literary criticism, paraphrasing Nesho Bonchev (one of the most acclaimed literary critics of the Bulgarian Revival) in his program article *Classical European Writers in Bulgaria Language and the Benefit from Studying My Writings* – “Self-awareness is the beginning of literature” (Bonchev, 1873, p. 3). In turn, the different positions of the Bulgarian critics regarding the reception of the work are not just a consequence of certain mismatching opinions based on professional and interpersonal relationships. They are also a cause and condition for the creation of Revival criticism in the public space.

The object of this report (1) is to see how the ancient canon is shaped through the consideration of two landmarks for the Revival culture issues – one is connected with the characteristic phenomenon of **Bulgarisation** of the texts and the adaptation or the question of how to translate an exemplary work like the *Iliad* by Homer – “the first monument of the ancient Greek literature” (Boganov, 1996, p. 5). Such is the case with critical discussion between Marko Balabanov (Balabanov, 1871, pp. 337 – 340), Nesho Bonchev (Bonchev, 1871, pp. 81 – 109), Lazar Jovchev (Jovchev, 1871, pp. 481 – 485), Lyuben Karavelov (Karavelov, 1872, p. 143), Hristo Botev (Botev, 1873, p. 11) about the Parlichev's translation (2) of the *Iliad* (Parlichev, 1871, pp. 340 – 344; pp. 387 – 390; pp. 485 – 492). Parlichev is the first translator of the *Iliad* in Bulgarian language. Later the debate is renewed by Konstantin Velichkov, Assen Raztsvetnikov and Mihail Arnaoudov. They defend the translation technique of G. Parlichev and highlight its advantages, despite its moving away from the original in terms of the language, style and versification. Parlichev's translation, of course, also has its negative assessments (for example those of A. Milev and B. Penev), which prolong and intensify the conflicting opinions. The charge of the current critical argument is supported by a perpetual doubt in G. Parlichev as a poet, translator and critic “in his own capacity as well as in the proper evaluation of his contemporaries” (Damyanova, 2011, p. 67). It is this hesitation that R. Damyanova reads in its paradoxicality and focuses on “the constructive emotion in the overall picture of Bulgarian Revival” (Damyanova, 2011, p. 67).

The other question, better known as “Homeric question”, problematizes the very existence of the historical figure of Homer and the nature of his works. “The big question” is relevant for European critical stage of scientific debate in the XVIIIth, XIXth and XXeth centuries. In this scientific dispute two names stand out – the representative of German Classicism Johann Herder and founder of Classical Philology Friedrich Wolf. (The Homeric question is brought up exactly in his book *Introduction into Homer*. Wolf claims that the epic poems did not exist in the form that we know

today.) Simultaneously with this, the scientific questioning of Homer as the single author of poems the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is advocated in the Bulgarian Revival context in the face: First – of the first Bulgarian critic of Homer Nayden Gerov (3). Second – in the face of the “second Homer” – in Greek press Grigor Parlichev (4) is called on awarding ceremony to be awarded within a poetic Competition in Athens for his poem *Serdar*, (1860). And third – in the face of one of the most prominent critics and of the people that are critical towards the skills of Parlichev – Luben Karavelov. These critics ideologically use the common name “Homer” as a folk singer, proceeding from the romantic stream of the folk as an individualized poetic genius.

Consequently the reading and understanding of classical ancient work is another reason for the critical disagreements about the boundaries “for the reception of the artistic fact of different categories of readers” (Lekov, 1989, p. 7) than the literary-historical interpretations of the text itself. Very significant is the scientific reflection on the familiar trend of “artistic re-creation” of “redrawing” (Dinekov, 1977, p. 16) of the source text to the expectations of the Audience perceived literature. One of “the most brilliant representatives of the Bulgarian critical thought” (Dinekov, 1977, p. 30) N. Bonchev rises ancient culture to a high “Classical” level with his program article, named *For Schools* and also with the essay I mentioned in the beginning of this article – *Classical European Writers in Bulgarian Language and the Benefit from Studying My Writings*. No less crucial is the role of the epistolary correspondence of criticism with Marin Drinov (he is one of the originators of the Bulgarian historiography), which reveals “the genesis of his literary critical articles” (Damyanova, 1995, p. 73). These letters of N. Bonchev are a new stage in the socio-cultural situation of the XIXth century, in which stage R. Damyanova recognizes “another model of literary communication” (Damyanova, 1995, p. 72). In one of the letters to Marin Drinov (July 2, 1871, Moscow) the urge of Bonchev to translate part of the *Iliad* is visible, which later in the article will be reaffirmed, as well as his interest in another exemplary ancient author: “I have translated some of Homer to show how wrong the translation of Parlichev is [...] now I am reading Herodotus” (Bonchev, 1983, p. 353).

The Bulgarian critic is in a dialogue with both “the elite readership, with the ideal reader of the future” (Lekov, 1989, p. 7) and with the mass reader who is accustomed to the established tradition to read generally accessible and popular textbook literature. This gives an incentive to Docho Lekov to talk about a “two-faced projection” of the dialogue between the translator and critic, for the formation of a new literary taste and culture. Not surprisingly, the reception of Homer creates a constructive field for the critical thinking in the cultural situation of the Bulgarian Revival. Another major controversy is the “unleashed critical battle” between N. Bonchev and Stefan Bobchev about “the receptional orientation of the Bulgarian culture” (Aretov, 2001, p. 145), the designation that N. Aretov made about three types of attitude towards translated literature – “classicist or academic”, “realistic” and “utilitarian” (Aretov, 2001, p. 137). Here, however, will not be considered this particular critical dispute, as well as the question of which high specimens of antiquity are valued and privileged over others and why, what ancient texts are translated and which remain in manuscript.

Interesting is the ‘obvious’ (5) and ‘imaginary’ (6) dialogue between G. Parlichev and N. Bonchev through their critical articles, manuscripts, letters, prefaces. Through them they form the figure of the translator in its various shades of a theoretician and poet. In the review article *Classical Education in Bulgaria* B. Bogdanov determines exactly this controversy as “an important page in the history of classical education” (Bogdanov, 1999, p. 11). In one of the first comprehensive pictures of the Homeric translation A. Milev gives a meaning and defines the discussion that arises from the translation: “We should no longer dwell on Parlichev’s translation. It belongs to the past. Now the focus of interest is not so much the translation itself, but the literature that was created around it” (Milev, 1936, p. 890). Later again, the translated Homer becomes an occasion to bring out in an oppositional pair both translation presences of the artist and the critic. First – the opinion and suspicion of the poet, but also of the philologist A. Razsvetnikov are in conflict against the principal differences of the literarian but also a poet A. Milev. Second – the critical debate between Mihail Arnaoudov and B. Penev, which very much reminded of the dispute between Marko Balabanov, Lazar Jovchev, N. Bonchev and L. Karavelov on two types of narrative – the idyllically praising one and the critically sabotaging one.

We should not overlook the essential similarity in critical disagreements and this is precisely

the expressively emotional speech as an integral part of the “cultural happening in the XIXth century” (Damyanova, 2004, p. 118). Despite the serious analytical and reasoned thought of N. Bonchev regarding shortcomings of Parlichev's translation, his criticism can be recognized as criticism with “heat”, “principles”, “energy” and “soul” (as expressed Slaveykov). The weapon of this type that calls for “passion for reading” (Bonchev, 1983, p. 351) and for lack of “delicate feelings” (Bonchev, 1871, p. 82) paradoxically turns the critical thought into defamation and extreme negations. And if N. Bonchev sets out the ideological ultimatum “Who is not with us in this field, he is against us” (Bonchev, 1871, pp. 82 – 83), Lyuben Karavelov gets as far as setting out direct personal insults through denunciatory self-reflection of the imaginary “not a poet, but a mortal” Parlichev: “Two years ago, when I was as stupid as ram I translated the *Iliad* by Homer and the pieces of evidence brought by mister Bonchev have been so convincing and so plausible that even I myself had to agree that my head is made of simple material” (Karavelov, 1872, p. 144). The full denial of Parlichev's translation gives an occasion to lack of questioning him in his qualities as a poet, which suggests a lack of awareness of N. Bonchev, H. Botev and L. Karavelov for the poems *The Serdar* and *Skenderbey*. L. Karavelov “puts Parlichev on the same level with Angel Piskyuliev, Krustiu Pishurka, Todor Stanchev and others, known as talentless writers” (Topalov, 2007, p. 194). However, it is an undisputed contribution of Bonchev's “critical pathos or ruthless ascertainment” (Damyanova, 1995, p. 73) for the translation of Parlichev.

With the published article for the magazine *Community Center* the Bulgarian critic displayed the Bulgarisation and the free translation as inoperable and outdated in the context of the 70s in the XIXth century – he puts “an end to a phenomenon of indiscriminate changes and cuts in translations, which could become a tradition in the young Bulgarian literature and cause great damage to our literary development” (Dinekov, 2007, p. 646). The understanding of the free handling of the original for the purposes of accessible and understandable form and utilitarianism is read as a “tradition of mischief” which penalizes the original text and its cultural, artistic and linguistic values. Not surprisingly the reception of the *Iliad* is an exemplary *nugget* phenomenon for any readership from antiquity till today – whether and how to “translate” the spirit of Homer's poem. And exactly this translational solution of G. Parlichev that departs from the authentic representation of the original proves that the *Iliad* is “a kind of monument of freedom of understanding” (Bogdanov, 1996, p. 7). This gives an occasion to B. Bogdanov to give a similar importance to Bulgarian tradition with its “so many other attempts” (Bogdanov, 1996, p. 7) beyond the good translation of Homer, because the classical works rely also on the misunderstanding of “arbitrariness” of the perspective.

The reception of the *Iliad* during the Bulgarian revival is a good example of how the classic literary text “is not a monument which reveals his eternal essence through a monologue. The work resembles a score, oriented towards the ever renewing resonance of the reading. In this way it releases the text of the matter of the words and puts his current existence” (Jauss, 1998, p. 48). The process of adapting sometimes makes a compromise with the language, the style of the original. It even determines the choice of translating a classic pattern mainly to comply with enlightenment purposes. M. Vrina-Nikolov shows the “double role” of translated literature – to compensate for the lack of original works and to form readers' taste. The researcher shows how the so called Bulgarisation is analogous, similar to the “Frenchification” (Vrina-Nikolov, 2004, p. 220) that occurred two centuries earlier. This typical process of adaptation and assimilation of classical texts is in view primarily on its pragmatic function and not with a view to its literary or historical function as a source for the history of the ancient culture.

In fact, in the literary-historical reading of the Bulgarian translation of Homer has several underlying allegations to which we could approach with a great deal of critical doubt and the aura of their undoubtfulness can be debunked. In an impersonator's address stands the iterance of the “first” translation of G. Parlichev and his “snatch” towards the original text on the lexical use and the versification. Hence comes the reason for the emergence of the exemplary translation of N. Bonchev as an ostentatious questioning and dissatisfaction contrary to Balabanov's expectation. As an editor Balabanov publicly expressed satisfaction with the translation of Parlichev and invited readers to such reading, hoping “the translation does not give the readers an unrealistic vibe” (Balabanov, 1871, pp. 339 – 340). Because of his undoubtedly more professional translation skills, as

if unnoticed remains one imagined statement that Bonchev's translation "for a long time is in the textbooks for secondary schools and in various other study books" (Lazova 2002, p. 82) (7). The latest opinion refers to an "unwritten yet story about the reader and viewer" (Lekov, 1989, p. 3), which, unfortunately, seems impossible to become a discourse and creates an apparent and unavailable presence of Bonchev's translation in the academic literature of the Revival.

After a careful search of such a presence from 1871 to 1878, the only place in which we can see a translation of the first four verses of Nesho Bonchev is the textbook of Todor Shishkov *Elementary Letters in Two Courses* (1873). It is translated from the Russian textbook of N. Minin and is combined with other Russian and French textbooks. In the section, called *About the Versification* and the subsection called *Particular of the Literary and Folk Poetry* where the Greek hexameter is explained occurs Bonchev's translation (p. 62) in accordance with the Russian translation of **N. I. Gnedich** set out in the *Theory of Letters* (p. 42). Here, however, it is worth mentioning that another book – *Art of Songmaking and Verse-making* (1871) by P. Odzhakov, mentions Homer in the translation of G. Parlichev (p. 123). There is no way that there could be a choice about which translation should be given as an example in the section *Artificial Poems and Fables*, because the textbook was released on March the 24th, 1871, and Bonchev's translation came out of print on June the 26th in the same year.

Once again Parlichev's translation is mentioned in a footnote in the book *History of Bulgarian People* (1873) in connection with the claim of Todor Shishkov that the language of the translation of the *Iliad* is "a fictional Slavic-Bulgarian" and cannot belong to the literature of the Macedonian dialect – "If somebody had told us to include in them the translation of the first song of Homer's 'Iliad' by Gr. Parlichev, it would have been a pretension, because: 1) This translation **is proved to be not right**, and 2) it is written not in a pure Macedonian dialect, but in **an imaginary Slavic-Bulgarian**, in which Georgi Rakovski has written 'Forest traveler'" (Shishkov, 1973, pp. 78 – 79). What's curious here is the two arguments that Todor Shishkov makes about the non-artistic and non-linguistic quality of the translation. On one hand, the claim that "this translation is proven by someone to be unjust to the original" without mentioning who proves it, means that the critical figure of N. Bonchev is popular enough. And on the other hand – the parallel with fantastic historical and linguistic vision. In the dialogue *Critic and translator* Parlichev enters in a critical argument with Shishkov, defending his plan for an "All-Slavic language" as a new different model: "All that is new and bold, causes murmuring and persecution" (Topalov, 2007, p. 195).

The other existing translations prior to Parlichev's first one are manuscripts and this was the reason why they were inaccessible and unknown to the public of the Revival. Still, it would only be right to mention and rehabilitate the unpublished translations of Homer: firstly, more than three decades earlier Gavrail Krastevich translates the first three books of the *Iliad* and mentions them in a letter to his teacher Raino Popovich (in Greek, on September 24th, 1836) – "Therefore, having, as I said, enough free time, I translated **the Iliad of Homer first, second and third song**, but I have not yet edited them. Moreover, I have translated from French; inter alia, 'The Wisdom of Richard'" (emphasis added. M. – AS) (Snegarov, 1959, pp. 91 – 92). Much later, in 1882, Philip Veliev publishes the first six books of the *Iliad*, while by that time the Bulgarian readers are familiar only with the first two books.

In the 40s, in the first issue of the *Lyuboslovie* magazine (1844) Konstantin Fotinov publishes two verses from the *Iliad*. For the aims of his nationalist ideological statement, Fotinov takes into account the commentary of Ioan Tzetzes who identifies the ancient peons mentioned in the *Iliad* (migrants in Troy, fighting against the Greeks) as Bulgarians (Danova, 1994, p. 302). And in a note N. Danova giving the source: "Corpus, 1729/1733, vol. 12; Georgii Acropolitae Historia, p. 32, cap. LXX" (Danova, 1994, p. 409).

On one hand, we can see the conscious twist and mythologizing of the "Bulgarian presence in the antiquity" (Danova, 2000, 14). On the other hand, it is curious to note the undaunted use of an ancient poet with an obviously disputed status of the author as an authentic historical source. It is highly unlikely that Fotinov was familiar with the fact that Aristotle (criticized the use of poetry as an "authentic" source, alluding to Homer, Alcaeus and Solon (8). But the Bulgarian author takes into account the "selectivity while working with the sources" and aims to make premises for a "Slavic

historiographic statement” using a “conscious falsification” – “Fotinov is obviously certain that Danova’s thesis about the participation of the Slavs in the Trojan War it is not subject of any doubt” (Danova, 1994, pp. 302 – 303). Moreover, the quote in question from Homer’s Book 13 (“the Mysians, fighters at close quarters, the noble Hippomolgi, who live on milk, and the Abians, justest of mankind” (Milev-Dimitrova, 1969, online edition) is quite problematic on the grounds to be credible. In a footnote A. Milev and B. Dimitrova state that “the mentioned Hippomolgi (those who milk mares) and Abians (the mild people) are not known to be historical tribes”. The mythopoetic narrative is easily combined with the historiographical story of the Enlightenment, which claims to be accurate and critic towards the facts of the past.

There are at least three more existing translations of the *Iliad* in manuscript – the one of Neofit Rilski, the one of P. Slaveykov before the 50s and the one of Nayden Gerov from the 70s of the XIXth century. For the purpose of this reading about the critical disagreements regarding Homer I will take a look at the translation and article by N. Gerov. His example of the first twelve verses of Book II of the *Iliad* is published in *Fond 22*. This translation is a response to the letter of Philip Veliev to N. Gerov requesting the translation he has prepared. Several things draw the attention – first, similarly to the dialogue between Parlichev and Bonchev, again one of the translators gives an example of how Homer should be translated. In a few places one can see that Veliev’s translation is closer to the contemporary translation in comparison to the one that Gerov made. For example, on a lexical level – Veliev translates the Greek word “ἥρωες” as “hero” in the manuscript and as “brave heroes” in the book (1882), while Gerov, as well as Parlichev, Bonchev and Slaveykov uses the word “*iunak*” – a word, specific for the Bulgarian folklore and the Bulgarian heroic epic songs, which could be translated as hero, brave rebel, champion. In Veliev’s translation we can see the translator’s desire to get closer to the context of ancient cultural history, while simultaneously taking into consideration the “horizon of expectation” (Jauss, 1998, p. 58) of the Revival’s reader. Secondly, the correspondence between Gerov and Veliev takes place in the 70s and Veliev’s translation only comes out in the 80s which reveals the working process on Book II. A comparison between the two translations is yet to be done. This should answer the questions, to what extent has the example been of use, later, for the teacher of Kazanlak and to what extent Veliev’s draft corresponds to the printed version in terms of verse/versification. A quick juxtaposition confirms the use of the same translation technique – twelve-syllable rhymed lines. It is interesting that in Gerov’s archive the translation of *The Adventures of Telemachus* (François Fénelon) and the “Bulgarised” translation of *Robinson Crusoe* (D. Defoe) by Nesho Gruev were found. These transcripts have been probably used as textbooks in N. Gerov’s teaching.

Exceptionally interesting is the place of the not so well-known fragment about the Homeric question from Gerov’s critical article, named *Several Thoughts on the Bulgarian Language*. For the most part, the text is a polemic against the ideological propaganda in the magazine *Bosphorus Telegraph*. Along with the detailed examination of the history of the New Bulgarian language and its adverbs, the Bulgarian literature and education, N. Gerov touches the controversial topic of the interrupted continuity between ancient Greece and modern Greece. The provocative statement of Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer (*The Origin of the Present-Day Greeks*, 1835) is well-known and adopted by Bulgarian historiography tradition. The Slavified Greeks and the lost connection with the ancient heritage are present both in Gerov’s philological text and in G. Parlichev’s manuscripts. The anti-Greek orientation is directly stated by Gerov through the genealogical binding with the language of the Gypsies (“for the language of the Gypsies we only know that it has something to do with Greek”) based on common lexical units such as *luludi* (flower), *ohto* (eight) and others (Gerov, 1852, p. 19).

Parlichev describes the interrupted continuity in a different way: “What do the Greeks of today, descendants of the ancient Greeks (if we can even call them that way), who take pride in their ancestry, have in common with the ancient Greeks that they always talk about?” (Topalov, 1982, p. 32). This attitude can be recognised as a symptom of the withdrawal of the so-called “Hellenophiles” during the 70s in connection with the Bulgarian Church question. No less interesting is the way in which the “Homeric question” is interpreted in the context of the Revival and the simultaneous meaning it has: 1) First, to oppose the *natural genius* (9) of the ancient poet to the faceless mass of rhapsodes; 2) Second, to be incorporated into the general trend of European

humanist disagreement about the historical interpretation of Homer, the age he lived in, the specifics of the story, myths and versification.

Thus, in the 70s context four translations of the *Iliad* are outlined – those of Parlichev, Bonchev, Gerov and Veliev. The case with Parlichev's and Veliev's translation is interesting in terms of the reception of critics, readers and translators. Certainly, compared to Bonchev's translation of the *Iliad*, Veliev's one differs from "the original in terms of sound. The language is poor, some epithets are omitted, and others are added. And not only words, but whole lines too" (Lazova – Panova, 2002, p. 82). Although they were published in different periodicals (magazine *Community Center* and newspaper *Century*, respectively), Parlichev and Veliev have the same editor, M. Balabanov, who is heavily criticised for allowing these translations and defiling Homer. The difference is that one of them burns his manuscript and after that makes another one, even more loose with the aim of creating a "common Slavic language", and the other one publishes his translations in press and in separate paper edition which by 1884 has three volumes. G. Parlichev is not able to overcome his hesitation and never publishes his translation in its entirety, despite the polemic defense of K. Velichkov and him prompting Parlichev to get his translation to reach the reader because, in Velichkov words, "it reflects the beauty of the *Iliad* adequately enough to be read with pleasure" (Topalov, 2007, p. 196).

The modernistic critical response of A. Razsvetnikov to Parlichev's translation is not less valuable. According to B. Bogdanov this response "makes a discovery" (Bogdanov, 1996, p. 84) – it compares the eight-syllable heroic epic songs to Homer's dactylic hexameter. What are the grounds for this parallel and for Parlichev's decision as a translator to adapt the *Iliad* in the Bulgarian folklore verse? During the Bulgarian national revival, the affinity for the folklore and ethnography is manifested as a response to the ideas of European Romanticism. "In its original form in ancient Greek the hexameter is organised following the principle of musical emphasis and the differentiation between long and short syllables [...]. It becomes even more flexible because of the short caesuras, which divide it into three or four parts" (Bogdanov, 1996, p. 83). In its more complicated version, the hexameter "begins to sound like a miniature strophe". The poetic organization of the folklore epic poems is distinguished by a strict principle – the main poetic unit is not the strophe but the individual line. The observations of one of Bulgaria's most famous folklorists M. Arnaudov are also valuable and interesting: "Haidut songs, epic in tone and short in volume, remind us of the lyrical songs with their metrics (eight-syllable line – 5 plus 3). They can be filled with intimate lyricism that we can also see in several ballads. The Haidut songs, which are an apotheosis for the bravery of the heroes, always manage to keep their charm with all that is humanely pure and heroically sublime" (Arnaudov, 1997, p. 419).

The themes about the suffering of the people and heroism are close to the great theme of the Trojan war in the *Iliad* and the storyline about Achilles's wrath and revenge. It is worth mentioning that as opposed to Homer's poems, in the Haidut songs the main protagonist is not only a hero (the songs about King Marko), but also a heroine – there are several songs about **women voivodes** (Sirma voivode, Boyana voivode, Stoyana haidute, Irina haidute). The Bulgarian folk meter "has the advantage of being natural, inherent to the speech of the people. A distinctive example would be: 'Горе ле, гора зелена, горе ле, майко юнашка! (Forest, green forest; forest, mother of heroes!)'. But as alluring as the parallel (with the hexameter) is, it is not complete. The required caesura in the middle makes the line sound monotonous and purely folkloric" (Bogdanov, 1996, pp. 84 – 85).

Maybe it is precisely Parlichev's hesitance "in the search for answers [...] that poses the necessary questions of the time", which provoke the disagreements of critics about the classic works. The criticism of the Revival during the years 70s of 19th century affirms the name of Homer as a "cornerstone for every school" (Bonchev 1873b, p. 38). It lists important Bonchev ancient authors: "Then the law of God that high school must provide such education that when someone graduates a course in it can read freely and understand the writings at a major class writers: Sallustius, Caesar, Cicero, Vergilius, Livius, Ovidius, Horatius, Xenophon, Homer, Herodotus, Plato and Demosthenes" (Bonchev 1873b, p. 38). A new stage of the development of classic education and philology is *Prometheus* magazine (1935 – 1999) as classic researchers. His editor, Alexander Balabanov draws

parallel between the ancient symbol of the fire of Prometheus, the revival of the European humanitarian thought, and the universal symbol of the fountain – the new Greek literature, in order to sum up poetically the role of the classical civilization and culture – this is so, because Asia was *One Thousand and One Nights'* and Europe was "Prometheus".

Notes

- (1) Program for career development of young scientists, BAS.
- (2) The letter of Grigor Parlichev about the design of translation principles, is shown not in the issue 11, but in issue 13 (pp. 385 – 387) after the critical article of Nesho Bonchev in the same year.
- (3) The reasons for writing the book *A few thoughts on the Bulgarian language and the education among Bulgarians* from N. Gerov are Linguistic Matters relating to attacks of the ideological magazine *Bosphorus telegraph* (in issues 108, 109, 110, and 111, 1852).
- (4) Handwritten articles and notes in Greek, written probably between the 60s and 70s of XIXth century, are stored in Skopje University. Further citing is quotations by Kiril Topalov (Topalov, 1982, pp. 31 – 43). K. Topalov gives the citations with the normalization of the Bulgarian language for the only existing now scientific publications on the subject of K. Kyamilov. Read more *Meanders of thought* (Detrez, 2001, pp. 143 – 148).
- (5) The theme of "the clear thinking" and "the clear view" is advocated in article Petko Slaveykov *Obvious builders*. This topic is interpreted in the context of the self-enlightenment of the Renaissance publicity in the monograph *The Childhood and the intellectual history the Renaissance artists* (Kalinova, 2012, pp. 28 – 41).
- (6) In connection with the unpublished dialogue *Critic and Translator* of G. Parlichev as a preface to his second translation of the *Iliad* after burning the first in connection with the criticism of N. Bonchev.
- (7) It may be considered here the later textbook literature that is not within the scope of this study and is not verified exactly where Bonchev translation is placed.
- (8) Panova, N. *Aristotle and poetry beyond the Poetics* – paper presented at the international conference *The challenge Aristotle*, 28. 11. 2016.
- (9) By definition from Dryden and Sheftsbari which displays Bogdanov and adds: "The sum of the word genius is used in a modern sense, its first for him [Homer]" (Bogdanov, 1996, p. 43).

References

- ARETOV, Nikolai. 2001. *Balgarskoto vazrazhdane i Evropa*. [The Bulgarian Revival and Europe]. Sofiya : Kralitsa Mab [Queen Mab], 2001. 266 p. ISBN 945-376-003-9
- BALABANOV, Marko. 1871a. Otviz "Omir se prevzhda na balgarski". [A Review "Homer is Translated into Bulgarian Language"]. In: *Chitaliste* [Community Center], Vol. I, 1871, issue 11, p. 337 – 340.
- BOBCEV, S. 1874. Nashata knizhnina. [Our Literature]. In: *Chitaliste* [Community Center], Vol. IV, 1874, issue 5, pp. 155 – 158.
- BOGDANOV, Bogdan. 1996. *Omirovijat epos* [Homer's Epic]. Sofiya : Otvoreno obstestvo [Open Society]. 1996. 210 p. ISBN 9545200901
- BOGDANOV, Bogdan. 1999. Klasicheskoto obrazovanie v Balgariya [Classical Education in Bulgaria]. In: *Prometei* [Prometheus], Vol. I, 1999, issue 1, pp. 9 – 13. ISSN C608-6837-0861-539X.
- BONCEV, Nesho. 1983. *Sachineniya* [Writings], preface P. Dinekov. Sofiya : Balgarski pisatel [Bulgarian Writer], 1983. 472 p.
- BONCEV, Nesho. 1871b. Kriticheska statiya "Chitaliste" [A Critical Article "Community Center"]. In: *Periodichesko spisanie* [Periodical Magazine], Vol. I, 1871, issue 4, pp. 81 – 109.
- BONCEV, Nesho. 1873a. Klasicheski evropejski pisateli na balgarski ezik I polzata ot izuchavaneto na sachineniyata im. [Classical European Writers in Bulgarian Language and the Benefit from Studying my Writings]. In: *Periodichesko spisanie* [Periodical Magazine], Vol. I, 1873, issue 7-8, pp. 3 – 13.
- BONCEV, Nesho. 1873b. Za uchilistata. [For the Schools]. In: *Periodichesko spisanie* [Periodical

- Magazine], Vol. I, 1873, issue 3, pp. 3 – 16.
- BOTEV, Hristo. 1873. Zasto ne sam...? ["Why I am not...?" (A Satirical Poem)]. In: *Budilnik* [Alarm-Clock], 1873, issue 3, p. 11.
- GEROV, Nayden. 1852. *Nyakolko misli za blagarskiya yazik I za obrazovaniето u blagarite*. [A Few Thoughts on Bulgarian Language and Education Among Bulgarians]. Carigrad [Istanbul] : Peshatnicata na Carigradski vestnik [Printing house of Constantinople Newspaper], 1852. 50 p.
- DAMYANOVA, Romyana. 2011. Izpovednite tekstove na Grigor Parlichev v emocionalnata kartina na Balgarskoto vazrazhdane. [Confessions Texts of Grigor Parlichev in the Emotional Picture of the Bulgarian Revival]. In: *Grigor Parlichev i bratya Maladinovi: novi izsledvaniya i prochiti*. [Grigor Parlichev and Miladinov brothers: New research and readings], Sofiya : Sv. Kliment Ohridski, 2011. pp. 52 – 67. ISBN 978-954-07-3296-1
- DAMYANOVA, Romyana. 2004. *Otvad tekstovete: kulturni mehanizmi na Vazrazhdaneto*. [Beyond the Texts: Cultural Mechanisms at Revival]. Sofiya : ELGATEH, 2004. 336 P. ISBN 954-0617-07-6
- DAMYANOVA, Romyana. 1994. *Pismata v kulturata na Balgarskoto vazrazhdane*. [The Letters in the Culture of the Bulgarian Revival]. Shumen : Glauks, 1994. 100 p. ISBN 954-8164-22-1
- DANOVA, Nadya. 1994. *Konstantin Georgiev Fotinov in Cultural and Ideological-political Developments of the Balkans in the XIX Century*. Sofiya : BAS, 1994. 446 P. ISBN9544302719
- DANOVA, Nadya. 2000. Edna "vaobrazena" istoriya na Bulgariya. [An "Imagined" Account of Bulgaria's History]. In: *Literaturna misal* [Literary Thought], 2000, issue 2, pp. 12 – 17. ISSN 0324-0495
- DETREZ, Raymond. 2001. *Krivolici na misalta*. [Meanders of Thought]. Trans. G. Chivikov. Sofiya : LIK, 2001. 240 p. ISBN 954-607-454-3
- DINEKOV, Petar. 1977. Prevodite v istoriyata na balgarskata literatura. [The Translations in the History of the Bulgarian Literatura]. In: *Izkustvoto na prevoda* [The Art of Translation], editor Vladimir Filipov. Sofiya : Narodna kultura [Folk culture], Vol. 2, 1977. 285 p.
- DINEKOV, Petar. 1981. Prevodite v razvitiето na starite slavyanski literaturi (metodologicheski vaprosi). [The Translations in the Development of the Old Slavic Literatures. (Methodoogicheski Affairs)]. In: *Prevodat i balgarskata kultura (kam istoriya na prevoda v Bulgariya)* [The Translation and the Bulgarian Culture (to History of Translation in Bulgaria)]. Sofiya : Narodna kultura, 1981, pp. 9 – 19.
- DINEKOV, Petar. 2007. *Vazrozhdenski pisateli*. [Renaissance Writer]. Sofiya : Zaharii Stoyanov, 2007. 703 p. ISBN 978-954-739-959-4
- JAUSS, Hans Robert. 1998. Istoricheski opit i literaturna hermenevtika. [Historical Experience and Literary Hermeneutics]. Sofiya : Sv. Kliment Ohridski, 1998. 481 p. ISBN 9540712629
- JOVCHEV, Lazar. 1871. Otviz "Omira e pisatel bozhestven I bezsmarten". ["Homer is a Writer Divine and Immortal"]. In: *Chitaliste*. [Community Center], Vol. I, 1871, issue 16, pp. 481 – 485.
- HOMER. 1969. *Iliad*. Trans. Alexander Milev and Blaga Dimitrova. Sofiya : Narodna kultura [Folk Culture], 1969. 680 p.
- KALINOVA, Mariya. 2012. *Detstvo i intelektualna istoriya u vazrozvdenkite avtori*. [The Childhood and the Intellectual History at the Revival Artists]. Sofiya : Literaturnen vestnik [Literary Newspaper], 2012. 192 p. ISBN 978-954-9602-30-2
- KARAVELOV, Lyuben. 1872. Ot rubrikata Znaesh li ti koi sme? [By a Section Do you Know who we are?]. "A znae li Gr. Parlichev sto e obrazovanie". ["But does Gr. Parlichev Know what Education is"]. In: *Svoboda* [A Liberty], Vol. III, 1872, issue 18, pp. 143 – 144 .
- KARAVELOV, Luyben. 1874. *Razkazi za starovremennite hora. III. Starite gartsii. (prev. ot ruski)*. [Stories about the Ancient People. III. Ancient Greeks. (transl. from Russian)]. Bucharest, 1874. 114 p.
- LAZOVA, Ts. – PANOVA, Nevena. 2002. Homer. In: *Prevodna retseptsiya na evropeiskite literaturi v Bulgariya. T. 3: Klasicheska literature*. [Translational reception of European Literatures in Bulgaria: Vol. 3. Classical Literature], editor A. Nikolova. Sofiya : Prof. Marin Drinov, 2002, pp. 80 – 93. ISBN954430889X
- LEKOV, Docho. 1989. Nesho Bonchev i formiraneto na literaturnata kultura prez Vazrazhdaneto. [Nesho Bonchev and Shaping of Literary Culture During the Revival]. In: *Ezik i literatura* [Language

- and Literature], 1989, issue. 3, pp. 3 – 8. ISSN 0324-1270
- MILEV, Aleksandar. 1936. Balgarskite prevodi na parva pesen ot "Iliada". [The Bulgarian Translations of the First Book from "The Iliad"] In: *Uchilisten pregled* [School Review], Sofiya : Ministerstvo na narodnoto prosvestenie, Vol. XXXV, 1936, issue 7, pp. 887 – 906.
- VRINA-NIKOLOV, Mari. 2004. Ot vad predelite na prevoda: Istoriya na edna dihotomiya. [Beyond the Confines of the Translation: The Story of a Dichotomy]. Trans. Romyana Stancheva. Sofiya : Kolibri, 2004. 307 p. ISBN954-529-325-X
- PANOVA, Nevena. 2016. *Aristotle and Poetry beyond the "Poetics"*. Paper Presented at the International Conference "The challenge Aristotle", 28. – 30. 11. 2016.
- PENEV, Boyan. 1918. Salonna kritika [Lounge criticism]. In: *Pryaporets* [Banner], g. III., 1918, issue. 54. LiterNet: <http://liternet.bg/publish5/bpenev/salonna.htm> [2002-12-14]
- PARLICHEV, Grigor. 1871. Ot Alfa na Iliada. [Book 1 of the Iliad]. In: Chitaliste [Community Center], Vol. I, 1871, issue 11, pp. 340 – 344; issue 13, pp. 387 – 390; issue 16, pp. 485 – 492.
- RAZTSVETNIKOV, Assen. 1940. Balgarskiyat heksametar. [Bulgarian Heksametar]. In: *Prosveta* [Enlightenment], Vol. VI, 1940, issue 3, pp. 296 – 306.
- SHISHKOV, Todor. 1873a. *Elementarna slovesnost v dva kursa*. [Elementary Letters in two Courses]. Carigrad [Istanbul] : Peshatnicata na Balgarsko chitaliste [Printing House of Bulgarian Community Center], 1873. 210 p.
- SHISHKOV, Todor. 1873b. *Istoriya na balgarskiya narod*. [History of the Bulgarian Folk]. Carigrad [Istanbul] : Peshatnicata na Balgarsko chitaliste [Printing house of Bulgarian community center], 1873. 325 p.
- SIRAKOVA, Joanna. 2002. Prevodnata literatura ot starogratski i latinski u nas predi Osvobozhdenieto. [Translated Literature from Ancient Greek and Latin at Home before Liberation]. In: *Prevodna retsepsiya na evropeiskite literaturi v Bulgariya. T. 3: Klasicheska literatura* [Translational Reception of European Literatures in Bulgaria: T. 3. Classical literature], editor A. Nikolova. Sofiya : Prof. Marin Drinov, 2002, pp. 6 – 16. ISBN954430889X
- SLAVEYKOV, Petko. 1860. Proglasyavane na glasa ot pusto gore Teleleisko. [Proclaiming Voice from above Empty Teleleysko]. In: *Bulgaria*, Vol. II, 1860, issue 67.
- SLAVEYKOV, Petko. 1870. Yavnite truzhenitsi. [Obvious Builders]. In: *Macedonia*, Vol. IV, 1870, issue 54.
- SNEGAROV, Ivan. 1959. *Prinos kym biografiyata na Raino Popovich*. [Contribution to the Biography of Raino Popovich]. Sofiya : BAS, 1959. 264 p.
- TOPALOV, Kiril. 1982. Grigor Parlichev i grackata politicheska i kulturna istoriya. [Grigor Parlichev and Greek Political and Cultural History]. In: *Literaturna misal* [Literary Thought], issue 8, 1982, pp. 31 – 43. ISSN 0324-0495

Summary

The text will observe the adaptation of an exemplary work like the *Iliad* of Homer in the period of the Bulgarian Revival. Very significant is the scientific reflection on the familiar trend of „artisticre-creation“ of „redrawing“ of the source text to the expectations of the perceived literature. Not surprisingly the reception of Homer creates a constructive field for the critical thinking in the cultural situation in the Bulgarian national Revival. The new type of readership builds up from the self-knowledge of the new type of literary criticism.

About the author

At present I am a PhD student in Bulgarian Revival Literature at the Institute for Literature, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. I am also a member of the Academic Circle of Comparative Literature (ACCL) and of the Bulgarian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies (BGSECS). My interests are focused on culture during the Bulgarian Revival Period and on the formation of the first perceptions of Classical Antiquity via National Revival textbooks.

Andriana Spassova, Bulgaria, Sofia 1113, Shipchenski prohod 52 Blvd., bl. 17, 7th – 8th floors