

Bogdana PASKALEVA¹

Bulgarian Translations of τύχη: The Case of Sophocles' *Oedipus the King*

Abstract

The paper is dedicated to the history of translation of Sophocles' seminal tragedy *Oedipus the King* in Bulgaria. It studies the different strategies of translation that have been adopted by Bulgarian authors, when rendering the Greek word τύχη in contemporary Bulgarian language. In comparing the various translational versions of a short passage from the 3rd *episodesion*, and having in mind the translators' background and decisions, the paper argues that the instance of *Oedipus the King* is indicative of the productive power of translation. The comparison shows how displacements and shifting of meaning in the process of translation could bring about new, unexpected effects of meaning. This situation is also brought about by the specific way of reception of Ancient literature in Bulgaria, since not all of the translators have used the original in their work. **Keywords:** history of reception through translation in Bulgarian; Ancient Greek literature; Sophocles

Резюме

Българските преводи на τύχη: Едип цар от Софокъл

Текстът *Българските преводи на τύχη: Едип цар от Софокъл* е посветен на историята на преводите на ключовата Софоклова трагедия *Едип цар* в България. Той проучва различните преводачески стратегии, възприети от българските автори при предаването на гръцката дума τύχη на съвременен български. Като сравнява различни преводни версии на един кратък пасаж от трети епизод на трагедията и като има предвид изходните положения и решенията на преводачите, статията се стреми да демонстрира, че примерът с *Едип цар* разкрива продуктивната сила на превода. Сравнителният анализ показва по какъв начин изместванията и изменението на значенията в процеса на превод могат да породят нови и неочаквани резултати за смисъла. В случая, част от тази ситуация е свързана с една специфика в българската преводна рецепция на антична литература, а именно – фактът, че не всички преводачи използват оригинала.

Ключови думи: история на преводната рецепция, старогръцка литература, Софокъл

The current text will focus on the reception of Sophocles' tragedy *Oedipus the King* in Bulgaria with respect to the translations it underwent over the course of the 20th century. The goal of this analysis would be a better understanding of the reception history of this tragedy and the way it affected the general mode of integration of the European tradition within the Bulgarian cultural framework, the latter being marked by the characteristics of a belated and therefore atypical process of modernization. This general direction of research also implies the presupposition that the process of reception of European cultural heritage in Bulgarian (marginal) context involves a process of profound transformation of this very heritage. The transformation process must be regarded not as a mere adjustment of foreign cultural phenomena to a diverging cultural situation where they are supposed to

¹ **Bogdana Paskaleva** is a teaching assistant at the Department of Theory of Literature, Faculty for Slavic Studies, Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski". Her main interests concern the history of European literature, and most of all the literature of the Greek and Latin Antiquity, as well as of the Renaissance period.

be “grafted” as an external body. Quite the contrary, we are going to approach this reception process as a productive transformation, which affected Bulgarian cultural context in such a manner that transformed both the host culture and the imported elements as well. It means that the century-long Bulgarian reception of Attic drama brought about a new cluster of meanings, which are today shaping the possibility for innovative cultural production, adequate to the contemporary situation in Bulgaria.²

The analysis here presented is a part of a larger examination of the reception of Sophocles’ *Oedipus the King*³ in its Bulgarian translations. That is why its character is more alike to initial notes than to a finished study.

First, we must point out two fundamental sources for our research: these are the collection of essays *Съдбата на Едип: Българските маршрути (The Destiny of Oedipus: The Bulgarian Paths)*, published 2011 in Plovdiv, and Dorothea Tabakova's research on the translational reception of Sophocles (2002).

The collection of essays *The Destiny of Oedipus* appeared as a result of the workshop at the Plovdiv University from the year 2010, which explored the Bulgarian reincarnations of the figure of Oedipus. The workshop and the succeeding publication, however, had a broader research scope, including the problematics of the staging history of Sophocles' tragedy, as well as various literary, visual, musical interpretations of the same mythological persona. Of central importance for the present study is the opening essay from the volume *The Destiny of Oedipus* by the prominent literary historian Kleo Protochristova. Her text is exclusively dedicated to the history of the translations of *Oedipus the King* in Bulgarian and provides detailed information about all possible translations and their editions (Протохристова 2011: 9-23).

We are going to refer also to the research of Dorothea Tabakova, a classical philologist and a translator, but also a poet. This study is an entry in a volume on reception through translation of European literatures in Bulgaria,⁴ the entry concerning the translations of all Sophoclean dramatic texts (Табакова 2002). In this text Tabakova makes an extensive and detailed analysis of the history of reception of the Sophoclean corpus in Bulgaria, making insightful remarks on the quality of the translations, their various approaches to the original, their political implications and aims, their historically conditioned differences, the possible sources for transmission of the originals, etc.⁵

² This fact can be confirmed by the numerous re-incarnations of Oedipus in Bulgarian poetry and fiction during the years after the fall of the Iron Curtain in poems, drama, and novel.

³ From this point onwards, we will refer to the title of the drama *Oedipus the King* as OT. This is the internationally acknowledged abbreviation of the Latin version of the title *Oedipus Tyrannos*.

⁴ The volume in question is dedicated exclusively to the translations of Ancient literature.

⁵ Some important information could be gained also from the bibliographical guide on translations of Greek authors in Bulgaria – cf. Гръцки автори 2001. [Gratski avtori 2001].

In the present study, we are going to focus only on the tragedy by Sophocles *Oedipus the King*. Secondly, we will restrict the research on the forms of reception of this drama only to the history of the extant translations in Bulgarian language. However, we are not going to explore the text of the tragedy, or of the tragedy's translations respectively, in their entirety, but after having selected a number of passages, we are intending to juxtapose them and research the variations, transformations, displacements of meaning, that those passages present. (This approach has already been employed by some of the key researchers of the Bulgarian translations of *Oedipus the King* – Georgi Gochev⁶ and Nevena Panova (Гочев 2005; ПАНОВА 2009)).

The major part of Bulgarian reception studies assumes the sociopolitical background as a starting point for explanation of general and particular semantic displacements in the translations with respect to the original text. In our present study, we will proceed the other way around, namely – by taking the text itself as a starting point, and analysing not the reductive, but the productive potentials of the various translations. We will regard the text of *Oedipus the King* no longer as an untouched original that has to be faithfully rendered into a modern host language, but as a root-text sprouting new meanings, not always immediately, but also through the mediation of its long and rich reception history in European culture.⁷

The choice of the relevant passages is guided in our case by the interest in two key semantic junctions, engaged in the construction of the meaning and message of the whole drama and regarded by scholars as the two central and most controversial points within *Oedipus the King*. These two semantic junctions are the problems of *destiny* and of *guilt*. A second, philological reduction must be introduced here: the more general and intricate questions of destiny and guilt will be subsumed under the research of the appearances of two particular Greek words within the text of *Oedipus*. These are the words τύχη and ἀυτόχειρ. Thus, instead of tracing the history of the questions Bulgarian society asked in its reception of the ancient text, we shall follow the translations of two words, approaching them as word-concepts, as words which sedimented in their semantic scope the very history of the social relation towards the problem of free will and/or destiny.

The central scholarly controversy on OT could be summarized very briefly by discerning two extreme positions in the interpretation: the one end of the scale is occupied by the idea that OT is a tragedy about destiny and its inevitability, about the insurmountable and at the same time irrational

⁶ Georgi Gochev is currently working on a new translation of *Oedipus the King*, his version of the title being *Oedipus the Tyrant*. In 2017 some fragments of this new translation have been staged at the closing ceremony of the annual playwright contest, organized at the New Bulgarian University and, and published in *Литературен вестник [Literary Newspaper]* № 4 (2017). The parties of the chorus were transformed into a musical performance under the title *Melos* (2017). This information was kindly provided by Georgi Gochev.

⁷ For an exhaustive study of the European reception history of *Oedipus the King* from the Renaissance onward, cf. Lurje 2004.

power of divinity, whose innocent victim the human being is. On the other hand, we find a variety of interpretations that regard Oedipus' lot as the deserved punishment of a tyrant, a flawed character, whose ruin is due to his own vices and mistakes. A number of positions occupy the middle zone between the two extremes, stating that Oedipus' story is supposed to present a paragon of the universal *condition humaine* (Knox 1957). There is a small number of interpretations evading both alternatives, such as the one by Jean-Pierre Vernant (Vernant 1972), which goes along the lines of cultural anthropology, interpreting OT mainly as the story of a general confusion of the existential milestones that guide the structure of any social order.

If we sum up the problematic of the super-human forces that affect human life under the heading of the word τύχη, it is only logical to search and explore those passages from OT where the word τύχη emerges as a key notion, concerning the question of the exterior forces that have a fatal influence on human life.⁸ Under the heading of αὐτόχειρ we are going to subsume the question of guilt and responsibility of the human subject for his/her own deeds. Each of the two words functions also as the focal point of a broader semantic sphere consisting of multiple and complex sub-questions, magnetically attracted to the two centres, while the two spheres interweave in each other in an intricate way. Keeping this in mind, we will proceed analytically with the idea that the elements could be treated as discrete paths and therefore –separately traced throughout the text. In order to provide a suitable metaphor or a simile of the situation, we have to introduce the image of the semantic ellipse. Here, the ellipse should not be taken as a rhetorical, but as a mathematical figure. A semantic ellipse (unlike semantic circle or semantic sphere) implies two centres that can attract or irradiate meanings, could structure a double semantic hierarchy, without ever falling apart into two completely separated figures or autonomous fields. So, the age-old question about determinism or indeterminism of human action shall be represented as such a semantic ellipse the two centres of which are going to be the centre of interior determination of action (freedom) as well as its consequents of responsibility and guilt (αὐτόχειρ) and the one of external determination with its consequences of victimization and fatalism (τύχη). Our philological task should be the mapping of this semantic ellipse as well as examining the possible re-mappings that translations bring about.

In the present paper, we are going only to demonstrate a sample of this analytic method, part of a substantially larger research, dedicated to the Bulgarian translations of Sophocles' *Oedipus the King* and Euripides' *Medea*. The demonstration of the method will bear on the translations of the word

⁸ In March 2010, a master thesis has been defended at the Department for Classics of the Sofia University, on the topic *Translation of Words Meaning "Destiny, Fortune, Fate" in Sophocles*, by Svetlana Valkova, supervisor: Nikolai Gochev, reviewer: Mirena Slavova. To this moment, we have not gained access to this text. The information is kindly provided by Nevena Panova.

τύχη. The word τύχη appears relatively often⁹ in the text of OT, namely 27 times, in various meanings, which amounts to 1.76 % of the verses containing this lexeme, or a derivative of it. Only one instance presents the word in plural in the meaning of “well-being” – these are the very final lines (vv. 1524 – 1530), sometimes regarded as a later interpolation. Being a work of poetry, and not a philosophical text, OT does not employ the word or its derivatives in a terminological manner. It is rather a slippery and vague field of cognate meanings that are conveyed by it, and therefore, it is more than logical that a translator is supposed to render them in accordance with the relevant context in which they emerge and in keeping with his or her own overall interpretation of the tragedy. However, τύχη and its cognate forms delineate a network of interconnected meanings that pervades the whole of the Sophoclean text in a decisive manner. Therefore, in order to comprehend the interpretative decisions and displacements that different translations impose upon the original, thus producing the history of its translational reception in Bulgaria, it is of crucial importance to trace the meanders of this cob-web of τύχη-related meanings, masterfully woven by Sophocles.

We will now focus on one of the most popular uses of τύχη, Iocasta’s lines in the 3rd *epeisodion*.

Iocasta:

[...] Oracles of the gods, where do you stand now? It is this man that Oedipus long feared he would slay. And now this man has died in the course of destiny, not by his hand.
(OT 946 – 949) (transl. Jebb)

In these lines, pronounced by Iocasta, we find the first appearance of the word τύχη within the text with the meaning of “accident” (earlier, in the first *epeisodion*, τύχη already appeared as a synonym of a “good fortune” or even “happiness”). Here, in Iocasta's speech, τύχη acquires its more neutral meaning of a chance-event.

The paradigmatic Bulgarian translation of OT comes from the year 1946; it is the work of Alexander Nichev, probably the most prominent Classical scholar in Bulgaria after World War II. He is the author of two treatises on Aristotle's theory of poetry, and more precisely his theory of catharsis, published in French (Ničev 1970; 1982)¹⁰, as well as the leading translator of Aristotle's *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*. Nichev translated the corpuses of Aeschylean and Sophoclean plays as early as the 50's and 60's, as well as the corpus of Aristophanes' comedies. Testimonies exist that he intended to dedicate the same amount of attention to Euripides, a project, however, interrupted by Nichev's death in 1988 (cf. Табакова 2002: 106 – 118). It is a matter of fact that nowadays Nichev's translations are the most

⁹ For detailed analyses of the most of those instances, cf. СИНИЦЫН 1999. [Sinitsyn 1999].

¹⁰ Reviews of these books by Leon Golden 1976, 1984. For a more general examination on Nichev's achievements, see Гочев 2002; Гичева-Гочева 2018 [Gochev 2002; Gicheva-Gocheva 2018].

widely used and considered to be the official Bulgarian translations of both Aeschylus and Sophocles. Since it is the seminal Bulgarian translation, and the latest one before Georgi Gochev's new version from 2017, we are going to use it as a guiding line for the comparison of all other translations. It has a couple of decisive advantages – given the fact that Nichev was a professional in Classics, his translations were made from the original; secondly, he also must be praised for having invented a specific method of translation that solved many of the problems regarding the manner in which Greek metrics should be rendered in Bulgarian language.¹¹

Now, the short exclamation of Iocasta (who has just announced her willingness to perform libations in honour of Apollo and formulated a kind of prayer toward him, vv. 911 – 923), is rendered by Nichev as follows:

Ἰοκάστη
 [...] ὦ θεῶν μαντεύματα,
 ἴν' ἐστέ: τοῦτον Οἰδίπους πάλαι τρέμων
 τὸν ἄνδρ' ἔφευγε μὴ κτάνοι, καὶ νῦν ὄδε
πρὸς τῆς τύχης ὄλωλεν οὐδὲ τοῦδ' ὕπο.
 (OT, 946 – 949, ed. Storr)

Йокаста:
 [...] Божии прорицания,
 къде сте? Него трепетен избягваше
 Едип, за да не го убий – а паднал той
от своя смърт, не от ръката му.

The Greek text of line 949 contains the word τύχη in a specific causal use with the preposition πρὸς plus genitive,¹² and then the typical genitivus auctoris of ὕπο in an inverted position. Thus, we have two prepositions, designating the cause for Polybus' death, one cause denied, the other one affirmed: Polybus died “because of τύχη”, and not “because of him [i.e. Oedipus]”.

In Nichev's translation of this crucial line, we notice two displacements. The second, and probably less important displacement, concerns the negative part of the sentence. Polybus is said to have died (literally “fallen”, though in Greek we have ὄλωλεν, that is “perished”) “not by Oedipus' hand”. In the Greek original we don't find the word “hand” here, which could have probably passed unnoticed, as a poetica licentia of the translator, in case we hadn't embarked also on the investigation of the word “hand” in OT. As we have already noted above, it is the problem of “doing something with

¹¹ Details about the translational inventions of Nichev – see: Табакова 2002: 115 – 118; Панова 2009: 312 – 315. [Tabakova 2002: 115 – 118; Panova 2009: 312 – 315].

¹² Liddell-Scott: πρὸς + gen.: “of effects *proceeding from* what cause soever”. The preposition πρὸς + genitivus auctoris, denoting the agent of a criminal deed, is used at one of the turning points of the tragic action, namely the announce of Iocasta's suicide. To the chorus's question about the way Iocasta died (πρὸς τίνος ποτ' αἰτίας; v. 1236), the messenger replies that she died αὐτὴ πρὸς αὐτῆς. (v. 1237), “she herself was the cause of her own death”.

one's own hands" (αὐτόχειρ) that constituted the focal point of the ethical problem in OT (according to our reading). Thus, the absence of the word "hand" here must be considered just as significant as its presence elsewhere. However, with regard to this, we must point out that the decision to supply the word "hand" is to be found in the German translation by Georg Thudichum (1827): "nicht von seiner **Hand**". This translation was used by Panayot Chinkov in his 1938 translation of OT from German, who renders the line: "И ето че този човѣкъ е билъ сразенъ от сѣдбата, а не отъ неговата **рѣка**." A similar phrase we find in Georgi Zhechev's version (1937), translated from French (M. Artaud, 1859) and Russian (Shervinskii & Nilender, 1936 and Merezkovskii, 1902¹³): "Полибъ умира подъ ударите на сѣдбата, а не отъ **рѣката** на сина си". Here the French text that is used, the one by M. Artaud, adds the "blows" of destiny (**les coups**), but not the "hand" of Oedipus. However, we find the "hand" in Shervinskii's translation¹⁴ (also announced by Zhechev on the title page as one of his sources): "Полиб же сам скончался, / Как рок велел, не от его **руки**." Merezkovskii who was also announced by Zhechev on the front page, have a completely different interpretation of the lines, much more inventive, where no "hand" appears.

Turning now to the translations by Andrej Andreev and Nikolaj Vranchev, we have to point out that both stem from the year 1939, both are presumably made from the Greek original, the first one in prose, the second one in verse,¹⁵ and they both render the line by supplying the missing "hand". The rest of the translations omit the supposed hand with which Oedipus could have committed the evil deed, and keep to the literal meaning of the phrase "οὐδὲ τοῦδ' ὄπο", "[he didn't perish] because of him [i.e. his presumed son]". This is the case in the very first Bulgarian translation ever – a partial translation, published in the year 1884. A fragment of OT was included by Ivan Vazov and Konstantin Velichkov in the *Българска христоматия*, т. II (*Bulgarian Anthology*, vol. II), a project which was in keeping with the Enlightenment ideas Vazov and Velichkov entertained about the time of the Bulgarian National Liberation (1878), and which was supposed to present to the Bulgarian readers translations of specimens of the most famous and important works of European, Russian and Bulgarian literature. It is difficult to recognize the language from which Vazov and Velichkov translated OT (most scholars suppose Russian as the main mediator), as well as to determine who was the actual

¹³ For G. Zhechev, the translation of Shervinskii and Nilender represented practically the most contemporary Russian achievement in translating OT.

¹⁴ The translation of S. V. Shervinskii could have been used by Nichev, too. This translation appeared for the first time in 1936, in a collaboration with the translator V. O. Nilender, but it has been reprinted minimum six times after World War II. It appears to be the most widely spread modern Russian translation, although there is subsequent translation of 1950 by F. Petrovskii. Shervinskii himself was a prominent translator from all sorts of exotic languages, such as Middle-Asian languages, Arabic, even Bulgarian and Romanian. He was also a writer, mainly of literature for children.

¹⁵ N. Vranchev's 1939 translation must be regarded as the first Bulgarian translation of OT, that is both from the original, and in verse.

translator – Vazov or Velichkov.¹⁶ OT is represented in the *Bulgarian Anthology* with the 3rd and 4th epeisodia and the 3rd stasimon. It is executed in verse. Here we read: “Башта му / **Умира не отъ него, отъ сѣдба-та**”, which is actually much more faithful to the original, although it is sure that Vazov and Velichkov did not use the original for their enterprise. A very close phrase we find in the translation by Shestakov from the year 1852 (reprint 1857): “А онъ / **Не отъ него, но отъ судьбы погибъ.**” Even the enjambment appears at the very same position. Just as it is the case in Greek, we find “destiny” and no “hand”. Unfortunately, the two editors of the *Bulgarian Anthology* do not give us any indications about the source they used, but only two possibilities exist, if the editors of *Bulgarian Anthology* (1884) used a Russian version for their translation – it could have been either the earliest Russian translation by Martynov (1823), or precisely the one by Shestakov (1852 – 57). The rest of the Russian translations appeared after the year 1884. A structure, similar to that of Shestakov, is to be found in Zelinskii: “и вот теперь / **Его судьба сразила, а не он!**”, however, published not earlier than 1892.

This simpler decision was taken also by Alexander Balabanov (1911). Balabanov's translation is the first professional Bulgarian translation, made from the original by one of the leading figures in Classics around the turn of the 20th century. Balabanov suggests the following: “Полибъ е умрѣлъ **отъ своя смъртъ, не отъ Единъ.**” The name of Oedipus is supplied at the place of “τοῦδ’”, just as the name of Polybus – at the place of “ὄδε”, for the sake of clarity, but there is no “hand” of Oedipus. Geo Milev is the author of the first full verse translation of OT in Bulgarian (1925). Again, the source is not specified, but it is probably a combination of German and Russian,¹⁷ Geo Milev unfolds the

¹⁶ However, I am inclined to believe that it was also the French translation by Artaud that they used, even though Artaud's version was in prose. I will try to defend this claim throughout the current text. Moreover, the poetic quality of the translation is so compelling that I am prone to suppose that it was rather Vazov who executed the transition, or at least edited it, since he is definitely the more talented poet of the two. This hypothesis could be partially confirmed, if we trust the memoirs of Ivan Shishmanov, a man of letters and a Minister of Enlightenment – cf. ШИШМАНОВ 1976: 108. In these memoirs, Vazov tells Shishmanov the following about the enterprise of *Bulgarian Anthology*: “At that time, Velichkov conceived the idea that we could compile an anthology for the upper levels of high school. The idea was welcomed also by the publisher Manchev. Since I was his comrade in work, Velichkov invited me and I gladly accepted. The anthology of Galakhov served us as a model. Besides Galakhov, we used also French textbooks as well as the collections of Gerbel' and some other Russian editions. I translated the fragments in French directly from the original, and those in German and English – from Russian. We had commissioned to D. K. Popov to translate something by Byron, for the rest, he wasn't taking part of our enterprise”. Cf. also: Георгиева-Тенева 2013 [Georgieva-Teneva 2013]. From this fragment, it becomes clear that the main sources were French and Russian, while the only English original in the anthology was Byron, translated by a third person, D. Popov. However, Vazov does not clarify how the work on the translations was distributed between himself and Velichkov but confirms that he was able to translate also from French.

¹⁷ Tabakova speaks about a “probable lack of knowledge in Greek” (Табакова 2002: 112 – 114). She assumes a transmitting language such as Russian or German, and we will see in the exodus that Geo Milev's version has a lot in common with Thudichum's rendering of the text. However, in his analysis of the translations of the prologue of OT in the translations of Geo Milev and Alexander Nichev, Georgi Gochev proves it not impossible that Geo Milev might have used the Greek original, too. This assumption could be made on the basis of two features. The first one is the correct rendering of the participles ἐξεστημμένοι (v. 3) and ἐξεστημμένον (v. 19) from the verb στέφω, “to crown”, as “увенчани” and “с венци” in Geo Milev despite the fact that we don't find this in Thudichum or Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, where we only have “schmücken”, “to decorate”. The verb is also reduced to “обкитени”, “decorated”, by Nichev. The second characteristic

phrase into a whole verse: “Полибъ умира / [...] **не / убить от своя синь Едипа.**” This is something Geo Milev is inclined to do throughout the text – he prefers to render the meaning of the verses in their entirety even at the cost of inserting whole new lines in the text rather than sacrificing some of the nuances of meaning. Vitya Dimitrova, the first female translator of OT from French (1938), also doesn't supply a “hand”, but inserts the idea that Polybus “became the victim [...] not of Oedipus”: **“ТОЗИ ЧОВЪКЪ СТАНА ЖЕРТВА [...] НЕ НА ЕДИПЪ”**. “To become a victim of” could be a suitable translation for ὄλωλεν provided that we didn't know that Dimitrova's translation had been done from French, as indicated on the title page of the edition. However, it is not sure whether she used Artaud's version, as Zhechev did, but as indicated above, Artaud proposes the expression “a succombé sous les coups de”, which could have instigated the use of the Bulgarian idiomatic phrase “стана жертва на”, “became the victim of”. Very close to this version is the one by Dimitar Simidov (1946), the last translation of OT before the conclusive advent of communism in Bulgaria:¹⁸ **“ТОЗИ ЧОВЕК Е ЖЕРТВА [...] НЕ НА ЕДИПА!”** We do not have any indications about the source language that Simidov used, but it could have been the same French version as Vitya Dimitrova's.

To sum up, there is the group of translations that supplied a missing “hand” of Oedipus in v. 949: Nichev, Zhechev, Chinkov, Andreev. Of them, Zhechev translated from French and Russian (Shervinskii: “не от его руки”), and Chinkov from German (Thudichum: “nicht von seiner Hand”). Andreev and Nichev translated from the original. But the rest of the versions render the verse in a simpler manner, the logical subject being only “Oedipus” or “him”. This would prove an important detail in the context of the ethical problem of the subject of the action. The image of the hand will prove to be central to it, that is why it is so important that it should not appear in relation to the death of Polybus. It only enters the game with regard to the death of Laius.

is a curious translational mistake of Geo Milev's in v. 19, where he renders ἄλλο φῶλον, “another part of the people” as “друг клон”, “another branch”. G. Gochev's suggestion is that Geo Milev mistook φῶλλον, “leaf, twig, branch” for φῶλον (Gochev 2005: 215 – 216) [(Gochev 2005: 215 – 216)]. This could only happen if Geo Milev used the original.

¹⁸As scholars who study the reception history of Classical drama in Bulgaria underline, after the coming into power of the new post-World-War-II regime, the interest in having ever new translations of Attic tragedy practically disappears until the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989 (Табакова 2002, Протохристова 2011). The translations of Classical texts become the privilege of only few professional specialists in Classics, such as Alexander Nichev and Georgi Batakiev. A systematic approach was adopted by the new political system, an approach that has also its positives, such as the idea of professional, methodical and centralized politics of translation that is intended to represent to the Bulgarian audience the entirety of the Ancient literary heritage, first of all its seminal texts assumed as paradigmatic. This situation changes a bit at the end of the 70's with the creation of a new book series for translations of Classical texts, named “Library Hermes”. However, the drawbacks of this politics include the reduction of multiplicity and alternative interpretative approaches in translation. It is also important to underline the fact that in high school education, *Antigone* was the drama by Sophocles, which was supposed to be read and studied by high school students, and not OT.

Bibliography

Golden, Leon; Ničev, Alexandre. La Catharsis tragique d'Aristote: Nouvelles contributions. – *The Review of Metaphysics*. Vol. 38, No. 2 (Dec., 1984), 398 – 399.

Golden, Leon; Ničev, Alexandre. L'Enigme de la catharsis tragique dans Aristote. – *The Classical World*. Vol. 70, No. 1 (Sep., 1976), 41 – 42.

Knox, Bernard M. W. *Oedipus at Thebes*. Yale UP, New Haven, 1957.

Lurje, Michel. *Die Suche nach der Schuld. Sophokles' Oedipus Rex, Aristoteles' Poetik und die Tragödienverständnis der Neuzeit*. K. G. Saur, München-Leipzig, 2004.

Ničev, Alexandre. *L'Enigme de la catharsis tragique dans Aristote. Académie bulgare des sciences*. Sofia, 1970.

Ničev, Alexandre. *La Catharsis tragique d'Aristote: Nouvelles contributions*. Université de Kliment Ohridski, Sofia, 1982.

Vernant, Jean-Pierre. *Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Mythe et tragédie en Grèce ancienne*. François Maspero, Paris, 1972.

Георгиева-Тенева, Огняна. Българска христоматия от Вазов и Величков: Моделиране на културната идинтечност. – В: *Електронно списание LiterNet*. 19.05.2013, № 5 (162). [Georgieva-Teneva, Ogniana. Balgarska hristomatia ot Vazov i Velichkov: Modelirane na kulturnata idintechnost. – V: *Elektronno spisanie LiterNet*. 19.05.2013, № 5 (162).]

(<https://litenet.bg/publish4/ogteneva/bylgarska-hristomatia.htm>)

Гичева-Гочева, Димка. Предизвикателството Аристотел в контекст: развитието на аристотелознанието у нас; конференцията и едноименният сборник. – В: *Предизвикателството Аристотел*, съст. Д. Гичева-Гочева, И. Колев, Х. Паницидис. УИ, София, 2018, 7 – 20. [Gicheva-Gocheva, Dimka. Predizvikelstvoto Aristotel v kontekst: razvitiето na aristoteloznaniето u nas; konferentsiyata i ednoimenniyat sbornik. – V: *Predizvikelstvoto Aristotel*, sast. D. Gicheva-Gocheva, I. Kolev, H. Panitsidis. UI, Sofia, 2018, 7 – 20.]

Гочев, Николай. Александър Ничев за литературната теория на Аристотел. – *Критика и хуманизъм*. 13 (1) (2002), 35 – 50. [Gochev, Nikolay. Aleksandar Nichev za literaturnata teoria na Aristotel. – *Kritika i humanizam*. 13 (1) (2002), 35 – 50.]

Гочев, Георги. Прологът на Едип цар в преводите на Гео Милев и Александър Ничев. – В: *Венера в Пафос*. Сонм, София, 2005, 214 – 221. [Gochev, Georgi. Prologat na Edip tsar v prevodite na Geo Milev i Aleksandar Nichev. – V: *Venera v Pafos*. Sonm, Sofia, 2005, 214 – 221.]

Янакиева, Елена; Денева, Елха; Влахова, Бойка; Топакбашян, Ахавни. *Гръцки автори, преведени на български език 1878–2000. Библиографски указател*. НБ „Св. Св. Кирил и Методий“, София, 2001. [Yanakiyeva, Elena; Deneva, Elha; Vlahova, Boyka; Topakbashyan, Ahavni. Gratski avtori, prevedeni na balgarski ezik 1878–2000. *Bibliografski ukazatel*. NB Sv. Sv. Kiril i Metodiy, Sofia, 2001.]

Панова, Невена. (Без)опасната антична литература. Преводна рецепция на старогръцката литература в България (1944 – 1990). – В: *Соцреалистически канон / алетранивен канон*, Дойнов, Пламен. Пан, София, 2009, 307 – 325. [Panova, Nevena. (Bez)opasnata antichna literatura. Prevodna retseptsia na starogratskata literatura v Bulgaria (1944 – 1990). – V: *Sotsrealisticheski kanon / aletraniven kanon*, Doynov, Plamen. Pan, Sofia, 2009, 307 – 325.]

Протохристова, Клео. Съдбата на Едип – българските маршрути. – В: *Съдбата на Едип – българските маршрути. Материали от уъркшоп (18 май 2010 г.)*, съст. Кл. Протохристова, С. Черпокова, С. Видева. УИ „Паисий Хилендарски“, Пловдив, 2011, 9 – 23. [Protohristova, Kleo. *Sadbata na Edip – balgarskite marshruti*. v: *Sadbata na Edip – balgarskite marshruti. Materiali ot uarkshop (18 may 2010 g.)*, sast. Kl. Protohristova, S. Cherpokova, S. Videva. UI Paisiy Hilendarski, Plovdiv, 2011, 9 – 23.]

Синицын, Александр Александрович. Место Тύχη в трагедии Софокла Царь Эдип (к проблеме соотношения судьбы-случая и воли героя в греческой драме). – *Античный мир и археология*. 10, 1999, 35 – 46. [Sinitsyn, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich. *Mesto Týχη v tragedii Sofokla Tsary Эдип (k probleme sootnoshenia sudyby-sluchaya i voli geroya v grecheskoy drame)*. *Antichnyy mir i arheologia*. 10, 1999, 35 – 46.]

Табакова, Доротея. Софокъл. Еврипид. – В: *Преводна рецепция на европейските литератури в България*, т. 3, Класическа литература, съст. Анна Николова, акад. изд. Проф. Марин Дринов. София, 2002, 106 – 130. [Tabakova, Doroteya. *Sofokal; Evripid*. – V: *Prevodna retseptsia na evropeyskite literaturi v Bulgaria*, t. 3, Klasicheska literatura, sast. Anna Nikolova, akad. izd. Prof. Marin Drinov. Sofia, 2002, 106 – 130.]

Шишманов, Иван. *Иван Вазов. Спомени и документи, Български писател*. София, 1976. [Shishmanov, Ivan. *Ivan Vazov. Spomeni i dokumenti, Balgarski pisatel*. Sofia, 1976.]