

V. Ignatov, Dr.
N. Chernokozhev, PhD, Prof., research advisor
9. Lycée de langue française „Lamartine“, Sofia
SU „St. Kliment Ohridski“

THE GENRE OF DIALOGUE IN THE LITERATURE OF BULGARIAN NATIONAL REVIVAL – MEANING AND FUNCTIONS

Whether it is a transitional form to the drama (P. Penev, St. Karakostov, M. Bradistilova-Dobрева), a particular literary form, which undergoes a division between private literary and stage manifestations (Ts. Minkov) or a separate variety of publicism (Il. Todorov) the dialogue occupies an important place in the consecutive differentiation of the genres and genre reproductions of the literary thinking in Bulgarian National Revival. It is a preferable opportunity for ideological and aesthetic expression, mainly because of its well-established, non-exhaustive changes, especially in its starting position; because of the language - accessible, understandable, through which an idea or a tendency is imposed; because of its simplified characters system (*modèle actantiel* – Pavis 2002: 6), which brings out specific social types bearing the very defined world views, which in the course of the development of the conditional plot scheme in most cases either are confirmed or undergo a sharp transition.

The syncretism of the dialogical genre certainly facilitates something else that is particularly important - the immediate outlining of a clear, categorical assessment of a current event or phenomenon affecting the whole community. The intertwining of civic-publicistic and ideological and aesthetic suggestions into a unified conceptual structure determines a more direct synchronic view on one psychological type or social and political move. For example, through the dynamic exchange of replicas of characters protecting different, often opposite, ideas about the commented individual presence or public tendencies, a more complete picture of the life and behavior of the Bulgarian notables beyond the Danube is revealed, about the attitude of the "old" people to the founding and the activity of a cultural institution such as the Literary Society or the controversy over the church issue.

So far, there is no more complete and systematic study of the dialogue as a genre in the Revival literature. The need to fine-tune the broad conceptual fields he sets, to analyze and conceptualize his concepts and his poetological potential, also largely determines the actuality of scientific activities in this direction. This would help in the more detailed characterization of close but not identical inter-genre relations (dialogues - drama, dialogues - publicism).

REFERENCES

1. Брадистилова-Добрева, М. Предговор към Възрожденски диалози. София, Издателство на Българската академия на науките, 1985.
2. Каракостов, Ст. Българският възрожденски театър на Освободителната борба (1858-1878). София: Наука и изкуство, 1973.
3. Павис, П. Речника на театъра. София, Колибри, 2002.
4. Пенев, Б. Оригинална и преводна драма преди Войникова. – В: История на новата българска литература. Т. 3. София, Български писател, 1977.
5. Радев, Ив. и колектив. Енциклопедия на българската възрожденска литература. Велико Търново, Абагар, 1997.

6. Тодоров, Ил. Диалогът като жанр в българската възрожденска литература. – В: За литературните жанрове през Българското възраждане. София, Издателство на Българската академия на науките, 1979.