

ПРОБЛЕМИ НА ИЗКУСТВОТО

ТРИМЕСЕЧНО СПИСАНИЕ ЗА ТЕОРИЯ, ИСТОРИЯ И КРИТИКА НА ИЗКУСТВОТО

ART STUDIES QUARTERLY

ИНСТИТУТ ЗА ИЗСЛЕДВАНЕ НА ИЗКУСТВОТА
ПРИ БЪЛГАРСКА АКАДЕМИЯ НА НАУКИТЕ – СОФИЯ

2
ISSN 0032-9371

ГОДИНА 51-ва 2018



СЪДЪРЖАНИЕ

Ivan Stevović. Medieval Art and Architecture as an Ideological Weapon: the Case of Yugoslavia	3
Елисавета Мусакова. Четириевангелието НБКМ 1356 от Националната библиотека.....	9
Александър Куюмджиев. Икони на Никифор от Карпениси в България, приписвани на Христо Димитров. Предварителни бележки	21
Симеон Тончев. Възрожденски зографи в Хасковско и Димитровградско	33
Камелия Николова. Първото режисьорско поколение в българския театър.....	42
Николай Йорданов. Българският модернизъм и полагането на българския драматургичен канон via negadiva.....	49
Lino Bianco. Presentation of a Bulgarian Icon to the Head of State of Malta: History in the Making	55

РЕЦЕНЗИИ

Anna-Maria Totomanova. First Printed Edition of Tetraevangelia of Ivan Alexander.....	58
Албена Миланова. Каменната пластика в художествения живот и архитектурната среда на столично Търново.....	59

РЕЗИЮМЕТА	62
-----------------	----

CONTENTS

Ivan Stevovich. Средновековното изкуство и археология като идеологическо оръжие: случаят с Югославия	3
Elissaveta Moussakova. The four gospels NBKM 1356 from the National library	9
Alexander Kuyumdjiev. Icons by Nicephorus from Karpenissi in Bulgaria, attributed to Hristo Dimitrov. Prefatory remarks	21
Simeon Tonchev. Icon-painters of the National Revival period in the Regions of Haskovo and Dimitrovgrad	33
Kamelia Nikolova. The First Stage Director's Generation in Bulgarian Theatre	42
Nikolay Yordanov. Bulgarian Modernism and Establishing of Bulgarian Canon of Playwriting Via Negativa	49
Лино Бианко. Българска икона, поднесена на държавния глава на Малта: създаване на история	55

REVIEWS

Анна-Мария Тотоманова. Първо печатно издание на Четириевангелието на Иван Александър.....	58
Albena Milanova. The stone sculpture in the artistic life and the architectural environment of the capital city of Tarnovo	59

SUMMARIES.....	62
----------------	----



SUMMARIES

СРЕДНОВЕКОВНОТО ИЗКУСТВО И АРХЕОЛОГИЯ КАТО ИДЕОЛОГИЧЕСКО ОРЪЖИЕ: СЛУЧАЯТ С ЮГОСЛАВИЯ

Иван Стевович

Текстът представлява аналитична рекапитулация на начина, по който изкуствоведският дискурс към средновековните паметници от територията на бившето Кралство Сърбия, а след това и на социалистическа Югославия, независимо от два напълно противоречиви модела на идеологическо-общест-

вено устройство, функционира по един и същи начин в съгласие с „надиделогическата“ матрица – учението за сръбската хегемония, и културната назадничавост, най-ясно изказан в заглавието на статията. Обобщавайки характерни методологически примери, както и начините на споделяне на знанията за отделните паметници, статията разглежда югославската медиевистична историография на нивата на *концептуалните изследвания, структурата на излагане и на начините за популяризиране*. На всяко от горните нива на на-

учно изследване ясно се установява влиянието на идеологията, чиято крайна цел бе да се намали, редуцира сръбското, но не в по-малка степен и българското средновековно наследство за сметка на отворената реорганизация и реструктуриране на схващането на средновековието като период, формиращ „националните държави“, и особено образуването за тази цел на абсолютно неавтентична колекция от „материални свидетелства“ във функцията на псевдоисторически досиета на държавите, формирали се след разпада

на СФР Югославия. Това, което не може да бъде пренебрегнато, е, че големият принос и заряд на този идеологическо-методологически концепт излизат изпод перата на най-изтъкнатите сръбски изследователи от периода между войните. Техните извънконтекстуални занимания с материята, за която става дума, на пръв поглед създаваше илюзията за защита на националното наследство, но, в същото време, в диапазона от университетските учебници до специализираните студии широко отваряше вратата на бъдещото, т.е. съвременното идентифициране на националното средновековно изкуство в общностите, които на практика са създадени след края на Втората световна война.

THE FOUR GOSPELS NBKM 1356 FROM THE NATIONAL LIBRARY

Elissaveta Moussakova

Even though not unknown, the Slavic Four Gospels from the National Library in Sofia represents a remarkable example of 14th-century manuscript illumination, which has not been discussed in details. In this paper a full description of the preserved fragment is given, with emphasis on the ornamental embellishment of the text. Besides the hypotheses about the manuscript's origin, offered in previous publications, the author attempts now to reveal the meaning, which the teratological headpiece on f. 6r and the architectural headpiece on f. 81v were invested with by the scribe (or the artist). In regard to the first one, the fantastic creature in the animal, so called heraldic, motif, is identified as a senmurv. For this image, rare in the Byzantine and South Slavic book illumination, a typological link is established through a 13th century Gospel manuscript of provincial Byzantine origin, in which Axiniya Dzhurova detected the possible source for the couples of monstrous creatures in the Slavic teratological ornament. A significant change of the composition is made by introducing in it the cross on top of the headpieces in the codices NBKM 1356 and Hilandar 12, a Serbian Four Gospels of the first half of the 14th century. As to the second

headpiece, representing the Tree of Life by an overall, stepped form, surmounted by vegetal motifs and accompanied by tetragrams, usually written around the Cross, a reading of the letters ABMK is offered. In view of the gathered evidence, both headpieces may be interpreted in the aspects of the Cross, the Life-Giving Tree in the Christian soteriological doctrine. The refined execution, the parallels to distinguished artistic examples in Byzantine manuscripts, make possible to ascertain that the anonymous commissioner of the manuscript belonged with the higher social ranks. Also, attention is given to the copy of the older pattern in the teratological headpiece in the 17th-century Strelcha Gospels from the collection of the Church-historical and Archival Institute in Sofia. Due to the insufficient or lacking data about the date and place of origin, or about the provenance of the two Gospel manuscripts, many questions remain unanswered but what could be confirmed is that the codex NBKM 1356 is a real witness to the processes of re-activating the old literary heritage in the 17th century, recognized long ago by the scholars.

ICONS BY NICEPHORUS FROM KARPENISSI IN BULGARIA, ATTRIBUTED TO HRISTO DIMITROV. PREFATORY REMARKS

Alexander Kuyumdjiev

The article brings together all known for the time being works by the Athonite icon-painter Nicephorus from Karpenissi, made in the Bulgarian lands. It is argued that his icons spread across this country through the agency of the monasteries of Zographou and Chilandari on Mt Athos rather than being commissioned to him. In this sense, the role is underscored not only of the institution of taxidiotes, but also of the monasteries as such for Bulgarian places that needed Athonite icons at the turn of the nineteenth century commissioned those directly to the monasteries rather than contacting the Athonite painters. The choice of a particular painter in each case was left to the discretion of the two monasteries, which acted as the go-between in the negotiations between

the church donors and the icon-painters.

Several examples are given of incorrect attributions of works made by Nicephorus, which were until now ascribed to the Samokovian painter Hristo Dimitrov. These are the icons at the Metropolitan Church, Samokov (1793); the Church of the Holy Trinity, Ruse (1807–1808) and some of those at the Church of the Assumption in Pazardjik (1815). Along with the new attributions, a critical evaluation is made of the information about Hristo Dimitrov's training on Mt Athos and some information about the painters of the School of Samokov, based rather on legends, though accepted as science facts in Bulgarian literature.

ICON-PAINTERS OF THE NATIONAL REVIVAL PERIOD IN THE REGIONS OF HASKOVO AND DIMITROVGRAD

Simeon Tonchev

Greek painters had an enduring presence in the art life of the nineteenth-century region of Haskovo. Moschos V. from Edirne painted at the Church of the Assumption in Haskovo the images of Christ and the Apostles in the nave, in 1836 and the icons on the iconostasis, in 1840/41. Thus, his work is placed chronologically between 1836 and 1858. His icons are to be found at the churches in the villages of Gorski Izvor, Stoikovo, Nikolovo. The icon of St John the Baptist from the village of Stoikovo revealed the painters family name, Veliuv, though in its version in Bulgarian language. Stephanos K. Nikitas painted the murals at the churches of the villages of Nikolovo, Stoikovo, Garvanovo. A stylistic analysis revealed other works by him: the representations of the prophets from the iconostasis at the Church of St George in Stoikovo, eliminating most of the icons of the feast tier at the Church of SS Cosmas and Damian in Garvanovo as belonging to another painter. There are no icons painted by him in 1974 in this church for he ceased his activity in the mid-1960s. The icons by Nikolaos Adrianoupolitis (1) at the church of the village of Bodrovo are unknown to science. Alexi Atanasov painted the Church of St George in

the village of Dinevo in 1851 and that of St Charalampus in the village of Chernogorovo in 1864, where the iconographic schemes differ from the typical of the age. The inscription about the painting of the church in the village of Dinevo shows that the painter, though coming from Naoussa in Northern Greece, was a Bulgarian. His works are found also at the churches in the villages of Gorski Izvor and Dobrich; his latest works are of 1879.

THE FIRST STAGE DIRECTOR'S GENERATION IN BULGARIAN THEATRE

Kamelia Nikolova

The study deals with the advent and the establishing of the figure of stage director and the critical role played by him or her in creating a performance in Bulgaria's national theatrical life in the interwar period. To this end, the work and experiments of several emblematic directors are analysed, who have been widely recognized or have made their first steps into the field of stage in the 1920s and 1930s, such as Nikolay Massalitinov (1880–1961) and Chrisan Tsankov (1890–1971). It was this group that had formed the first stage director's generation in Bulgarian theatre.

So that to give the broad strokes of the profile of this first stage director's generation, the study reconstructs the theatrical aesthetics and individual styles of Geo Milev, Isaac Daniel, Nikolay Massalitinov, Chrisan Tsankov, commenting on the stage experiments of Boyan Danovski, Alexander Ikonografov, Nikolay Fol, Stefan Surchadjiev and Krustio Mirsky, who came to theatre in the decade preceding the end of WW2, as well as of the overall cultural and theatrical context, in which they came to put on their productions.

In conclusion, an inference is drawn that in the 1920s and 1930s, Bulgarian

theatre witnessed the advent, shaping and establishing of the figure of stage director enjoying director's proper, i.e. modern status first of all at the National Theatre and partially, in some other companies. The end of WW2 found Bulgarian theatre as represented by well-developed and fully-fledged director's theatre, actor's theatre and experimental director's theatre.

BULGARIAN MODERNISM AND ESTABLISHING OF BULGARIAN CANON OF PLAYWRITING VIA NEGATIVA *Nikolay Yordanov*

The study deals with the establishing of the Bulgarian canon of playwriting in the first half of the twentieth century. Two situations are highlighted: the 1910s, dominated by the confrontation between the group around the *Misul* (Thought) journal and Ivan Vazov. At the time, Vasil Drumev was deemed to be already a 'tradition', bridging the twentieth century and the period of the National Revival, while Vazov became the emblem of contemporary drama, bringing to life onstage the recent or remote Bulgarian past. A keynote study by Pencho Slaveikov, *The National Theatre* was published by the end of the decade, directly and categorically rejecting all the existing by that time Bulgarian dramaturgy.

The term canon, pertaining to Bulgarian literary practice, came to be introduced in the wake of WW1 by M. Arnaudov in his critically acclaimed study, *The Canon of Bulgarian Literature* (1922), which was published in a time, when social conscience, radicalised by the post-war crisis, attempted to figure out its cultural identity and a heated debate about the intrinsic values of the national culture flared up. Post-war modernism, bringing in new views of life, had tried and launched

its own aesthetic projects, each of which had to establish canons of their own: Geo Milev strived to launch the expressionist project; Ivan Radoslavov, that of symbolism; the far left, the social-class one, etc. All these echoed radical (European in the first place) projects in arts and literature in a quest for new art realities. Playwriting, though to a lesser degree than the other forms of writing, had not escape certain studies, articles and reviews' notice. This article is an attempt to highlight the most important of those, underscoring the nonetheless recurring appreciation of their achievements in the otherwise negative critical views of Bulgarian playwriting.

БЪЛГАРСКА ИКОНА, ПОДНЕСЕНА НА ДЪРЖАВНИЯ ГЛАВА НА МАЛТА: СЪЗДАВАНЕ НА ИСТОРИЯ

Лино Бианко

Тази статия очертава художествения фон на малтийско-българските дипломатически отношения. Годината 2016, когато се отбелязва 45-та годишнина от установяването на тези отношения, беше свидетел на интересна концептуална реализация, която надмина всички събития, чествани извън българската национална територия, ако се има предвид честването на светите братя Кирил и Методий. То се проведе под покровителството на държавния глава на Малта в президентската резиденция. Нейно Превъзходителство Мари-Луиз Колейро Прека получи в дар икона на св. Богородица, поднесена по време на визитата на изтъкнатия гост Борислав Боянов, Почетен консул на Малта в България, от негово име и от името на неговото семейство. Иконата е произведение на Студио „Димчовски“, намиращо се в с. Гостилица, Габровско.

АВТОРИТЕ В БРОЯ:

проф. **Иван Стевович**, изкуствовед, Университет на Белград, Философски факултет, Катедра по история на изкуството istevovi@f.bg.ac.rs

Prof. **Ivan Stevović**, art historian, University of Belgrade, Serbia, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Art History

проф. д-р **Елисавета Мусакова**, изкуствовед, Институт за изследване на изкуствата – БАН emoussakova@gmail.com

Prof. **Elissaveta Moussakova**, PhD, art historian, Institute of Art Studies – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

доц. д-р **Александър Куюмджиев**, изкуствовед, Институт за изследване на изкуствата – БАН margaritakj@gmail.com

Assoc. Prof. **Alexander Kuyumdjiev**, PhD, art historian, Institute of Art Studies – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Симеон Тончев, изкуствовед, бакалавър, Национална художествена академия simeon.tonchev@mail.bg

Simeon Tonchev, art historian, bachelor, National Academy of Art Sofia

проф. д.изк. **Камелия Николова**, театровед, Институт за изследване на изкуствата – БАН kamelian@hotmail.com

Prof. **Kamelia Nikolova**, DSc, Theatre studies, Institute of Art Studies – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

проф. д.изк. **Николай Йорданов**, театровед, Институт за изследване на изкуствата – БАН nikyordanov@abv.bg

Prof. **Nikolay Yordanov**, DSc, Theatre studies, Institute of Art Studies – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Н. Пр. проф. д-р **Лино Бианко**, Извънреден и пълномощен посланик на Република Малта в България и Румъния; архитектурен историк, катедра Архитектура и градско проектиране, Факултет за околна среда, Университет на Малта lino.bianco@um.edu.mt

N.E. Prof. Dr **Lino Bianco**, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Malta to the Republic of Bulgaria and Romania; architectural historian, Department of Architecture and Urban Design, Faculty for the Built Environment, University of Malta

доц. д-р **Албена Миланова**, историк, Център за славяно-византийски проучвания „Проф. Иван Дуйчев“ на Софийския университет milanova_albena@yahoo.com

Assoc. Prof. **Albena Milanova**, PhD, historian, Centre for Slavo-Byzantine Studies “Prof. Ivan Dujcev” at Sofia University „St. Kliment Ohridski”

проф. д.ф.н. **Анна-Мария Тотоманова**, старобългарист, Софийски университет „Св. Климент Охридски” atotomanova@abv.bg

Prof. **Anna-Maria Totomanova**, DSc, history of the Bulgarian language, Sofia University „St. Kliment Ohridski”