

**Interconnection of Political Processes and Literary Discourses.
Experience of Socialist Countries**

- **Irma Ratiani**
(Georgia)

1918-1921. The Idea of State Sovereignty and its Destiny in Georgia.
Before and After

...Before.

The idea of State Sovereignty might be considered as one of key ideas throughout the history of Georgia.

Due to its geographical location, geo-political function and territorial lack, Georgia often found itself in the middle of big political contradictions. Wars and the tragedies that occurred after the war were an integral attribute of the history of Georgia. From ancient times, large empires often conquered it: Iran, Arabia, Ottoman, Mongolia... The reaction of the Georgian society to colonialism was traditionally distinguished by the struggle to retain the Orthodox faith and restore the political status quo in all possible ways.

However, from the beginning of 19th century something different and even strange for Georgia happened... At the end of the 18th century, the issue of foreign political orientation of Georgia, in particularly east Georgian kingdom of Kartli-Kakheti, remained unresolved. Georgia had to make the choice between the three countries fighting for power in the South Caucasus: Iran, Ottoman and Russia. King Erekle II decided to conclude the agreement with Russia, since Russia seemed to be the most powerful political candidate in this fight and, besides, Russia was a country with the same religious belief. The main condition of the agreement was to keep the Kartli-Kakheti throne and the Georgian Church unchanged.

In 1783 the Russian Empire and Georgia signed a treaty known as the 'Treaty of Gorgievsk'. According to the preamble, it was a 'treaty of friendship', where the Georgian side was recognizing the 'highest government and protection' of the Russian Empire. The results of the treaty turned very hard for Georgia. Russia did not protect the conditions of the treaty and in 1801 occupied the territory of Kartli-Kakheti kingdom and soon – the whole territory of Georgia. Occupation of the Georgian territory by the Russian Empire lasted until 1918 (Guruli. On-line).

It was a tough 118 years for Georgia. The country was gradually losing all-important strongholds: political independence, the autocephaly of the Georgian church and some important values with all it. The conqueror, sharing the same religion, pursued the policy of “an enemy and a friend”: on the one hand, Russia enjoyed the privilege of an Orthodox country, and on the other one, tried to turn Georgia against non-Christian peoples living in the Caucasian mountains and bereave it of the necessary political self-identity.

Georgian society went through innumerable political doubts and battles, hopes and frustrations, until he concluded that the same religion does not obligate countries to be a one state!

It was Georgian romantic poet Nikoloz Baratashvili (1817–1845), who, despite the young age, discovered the main problem of Georgian people and declared:

“The unity of the faith is not useful for a state, if national features are different”.
(Destiny of Georgia/Bedi Kartlisa).

Because of the historical fate of his country, one of the central ideas of Romanticism – the idea of national self-awareness – becomes crucial in Baratashvili’s poetry. However, evaluation of local problems, traditions and customs, alongside with the basic themes and motifs of the World Romanticism, facilitated not only expansion of Romanticism in Georgia, but also drawing anew the map of Europe against the background of national self-determination and self-assertion as well as against the background of the cultural process of searching for a new identity (Ratiani 2018).

Soon after, in particular from 1860s, the religious strategy of anti-colonial movement, historically sited in Georgia, was replaced by the national strategy. The leader of this movement was Ilia Chavchavadze, prominent Georgian writer and publicist. Consequently, the idea of national independence became the main idea of Georgian critical realism, which covered and overshadowed the acute social-political problems.

“Ourselves must belong to us” – states Ilia Chavchavadze in the *Letters of a Traveler (Mgzavris Tserilebi)*, and with this phrase establishes a new standard of Georgian political and cultural thinking as well as of a new Georgian identity. Ilia Chavchavadze was murdered in 1907 and murder case is still unclear. In 1987 Ilia Chavchavadze was canonized as *Saint Ilia the Righteous* by the Georgian Orthodox Church.

Understanding of national values was never a case of radical patriotism or a cheap speculation for great Georgian minds. It was rather a way to join the best humanistic ideas.

“Some believe that genuine patriotism is contrary to cosmopolitanism, but this is a mistake. Every genuine patriot is a cosmopolitan just like every reasonable cosmopolitan (not those in our country) is a patriot. How? It is as follows: The person, who reasonably serves his own nation, trying to enhance his own homeland intellectually, materially, and morally, thus producing best members and friends of the whole humankind, promotes the development and well-being of the whole humankind” (Vaja Pshavela 2011) – it was stated by the outstanding Georgian writer and thinker, Vaja Pshavela, back in 1905.

Exactly with this mood and pathos, Georgia and Georgian culture entered the 20th century, full of new challenges and pain.

1918-1921.

The first decade of a new century was a Chiaroscuro of contradictory political events, which arose in the conditions of the vanishing imperial power and rising Marxism. As for Georgian culture, it was a period of flourishing Modernism and just establishing Avant-garde culture as a logical continuation of a Georgian national literary narrative interrelating with the World one.

High Modernism, with its diverse forms and tributaries, striving for representational freedom, as well as with the artistic tendencies of quest for the truth and establishment of individuality, was reaching its best.

The most efficient role in introducing the tendencies of European modernism in Georgia was performed by Georgian poets: Galaktion Tabidze (1891-1959) – outstanding figure of contemporary Georgian poetry (1891-1959), Terenti Graneli (1897-1934) – famous for his escapist philosophy, and brilliant group of Georgian Symbolists – *Tsisperqantselebi* (*The Blue Horns*)– Grigol Robakidze, Titsian Tabidze (1895-1937), Paolo Iashvili (1894-1937), Valerian Gaprindashvili (1888-1941), Kolau Nadiradze (1895-1991), Nikolo Mitsishvili (1896-1937), Giorgi Leonidze (1899-1966), Shalva Apkhaidze (1894-1968), Shalva Karmeli (1899-1923) and others.

Georgian modernist poetry overcame in favor of art the utilitarian approach to poetry and harmonized the level of Georgian verse culture with the Western standards.

No less contribution belonged to Georgian prose writers – Mikheil Javakhishvili (1880-1937), who worked on the edge of High Modernism and Realism, Niko Lortkipanidze (1880-1944), who introduced into Georgian prose typical characteristics of impressionism, Vasil Barnovi (1856-1934), Leo Kiacheli (1884-1963) and others.

They do not deviate from the centuries-old tradition and join with the current of the world literary themes the purely Georgian issues, including the “State Sovereignty”, so significant for the Georgian political and social history.

Meantime, the world around was changing rapidly and the most significant events were approaching the Russian Empire. In 1917, Bolshevism as a new political and social order was established in Russia as a challenge to the Emperor’s power.

In February of 1917 the first revolution occurred in Russian Empire, as a result of which the Russian emperor Nicholas II resigned from the throne and a temporary government was created. This information was very soon delivered to Caucasus, in particularly, to Georgia and soon after the whole hierarchy of the Russian imperial government has been dissolved in the Transcaucasian administrative center. Meanwhile, the two governing bodies were established throughout the whole Russia: temporary government and councils. On October 25, 1917, the Bolsheviks, although they were minorities, carried out a coup in Petrograd and overthrew the temporary government. This overthrow was not recognized by leading parties of the Transcaucasia and other organizations. That is where the independence of Georgia has been started¹. The State Sovereignty and the first Georgian

1 <https://www.radiotavisupleba.ge/a/vis-akhsovs-revolutsia/28711509.html>

Democratic Republic was declared on May 26 of 1918. Such a long-awaited freedom was a reality! It was soon followed by the exceptional event in the history of Georgian society – the foundation of the first Georgian University, Tbilisi State University, leaded by Ivane Javakhishvili.

Georgian literature greeted the independence of Georgia with great hope. In the view of Symbolist poets – *Tsisperqantselebi* (“The Blue Horns”), the renaissance, having started in literature, should have been followed by political renaissance. Grigol Robakidze noted: “The renaissance of Georgia has begun” (*Georgian Renaissance*). Georgia has found itself and together with political revival, renaissance of Georgian art has started, argued Shalva Apkhaidze. Prominent Georgian critic – Geronti Kikodze published his major work *National Energy* in 1919. The author was optimistic about the future of Georgia. Galaktion Tabidze, Giorgi Leonidze, Ioseb Grishashvili, Giorgi Kuchishvili and others devoted enthusiastic poems to this event. “The Downfall of Russia”, “Chivalrous Georgia” by Grigol Robakidze, publicist essays of Vakhtang Kotetishvili, Shalva Amirejibi, Mikheil Javakhishvili and others authors were written in the same period. It is noteworthy that in literary texts, on the one hand, the festive mood is felt, caused by this historical fact, and, on the other one, fear and anxiety, due to reasonable interpretation of reality, is observable. Euphoria of the first period was followed by this, not unfounded fear concerning the near future of Georgia. This is confirmed by literary and publicist texts of numerous Georgian writers – Nikolo Mitsishvili, Paolo Iashvili, Giorgi Leonidze, Ioseb Grishashvili, etc. Fear also becomes reality and finds equally active response in Georgian literature – in the texts of Mikheil Javakhishvili, Razhden Gvetadze, Vasil Barnovi, Aleksandre Abasheli and others. . .

In the consciousness of every reasonable Georgian, independence of Georgia – dream about freedom was ever alive. Although outwardly this was not often manifested actively, expectation of a suitable situation always existed, Akaki Bakradze wrote, „ree mankind is formed from free nations and personalities” (Bakradze 2009), Akaki Bakradze wrote. Georgian literature of 1918-1921 became a cultural application of this expectation.

After...

Unfortunately, in 1921 all was over! It became clear, that Bolsheviks needed just some time to get back to the issue of independence of Georgia and other republics; they intentionally and irreversibly were expanding their power throughout the former Russian empire. They have reached Georgia in 1921; after their invention, the three-year independence history of Georgia was ended. Symbolist poet Kolau Nadiradze wrote his tragic poem ‘*25th of February*’, whereas Nikolo Mitsishvili in documentary prose – *February* (1923, Paris) – described with high accuracy the forced Sovietization of Georgia.

Soon after “differently disposed” writers were easily declared as “enemies of the Soviet state” and their quality, often brilliant works – as anti-state activity; as a result – writers were invariably ending in punishment. A rather long list of Georgian writers, rep-

representatives of the progressive, Modernist and Avant-garde wing, punished for this reason can be drawn. But in this case, the tragicalness of the situation is created not only by the ruined fate of individual persons, but by the total break of the whole paradigm of the literary process, which as a rule needs a long cultural rehabilitation.

Writers put up with sacrifice, for they believed that all other ways were either compromise, which they could not allow, or a wrong mechanism of prolonging one's existence. Accordingly, quite a few writers revolting against the "ideal type" of slavish society consciously faced execution (Mikheil Javakhishvili, Titsian Tabidze), arrest (Niko Samadashvili (1905-1963)), exile (Grigol Robakidze) or even suicide (Paolo Iashvili). All these forms of "settling" the problem were identical in content, the difference lying only in the strategy of implementation. The writer himself was a tragic personality who fell victim to his own principles.

Lost independence developed into painful historical experience for the next 70 years.

Bibliography:

- Bakradze, Akaki. *Nineteen's Century*. <https://burusi.wordpress.com/2009/06/11/akaki-bakradze/> (In Georgian).
- Guruli, Vakhtang. *Treaty of Georgievsk*. <https://gfsis.org/files/my-world/12/06.pdf> (in Georgian).
- Ratiani, Irma. *Georgian Literture and the World Literary Process*. Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2018.
- Vaja Pshavela. "Patriotism and Cosmopolitamism". In: Vaja Pshavela, *Selected Works. Vol. 3*. Tbilisi: Institute of Literature Press, 2011.

- **Elka Traykova**
(Bulgaria)

Politics and Literature.

Political Processes and Aesthetic Transformations in Bulgarian Literature after 1989

Taking 1989 as a milestone in the modern history of Bulgaria marked the end of a stage in the political and social life, but it was also a turning point for literature. The repudiation of ideological clichés, the elimination of the aesthetic limitations, provoked the establishment of new authors, poetics, and languages in poetry, prose, and drama, as well as the unprecedented reading of the history of literature. Forgotten or forbidden individuals, works, and events were recalled. Through the emancipation from the limitations of ideological norms and the repression of political censorship in Bulgarian literature, new aesthetic tendencies were formed, which tolerated the artistic experiments and thematic provocations. Vigorously receding from the values of the socialist realism canon at the end of the twentieth century, it was a complex conglomerate of styles and plots of ambiguous artistic value.

Literature was topical and socially sensible, but was also reconsidering its history, recognizing its connection with forbidden or forgotten authors and works, rather than with the classical authors traditionally included in the sovereign space of the literary canon. The political change provoked interest in unknown literary narratives, theoretical and critical interpretations and extravagant creative expressions. This, mostly useful, but in some of its manifestations comical, striving to make up for the time lost, produced both bright creative gestures and moderate changes in the literary field. It began transforming not only as poetics, style, language, plots, characters, genres, but also in institutional and social terms. Opportunities for free publishing, the emergence of new periodicals and creative communities altered the cultural context – free from restrictions and taboos, tolerating the gestures of denial, but also of remorse. Literature was firmly driven away from its closed, elite self-sufficiency; it was seeking alternative forms of public realization. This is the time of literary festivals, the blooming of poetry, prose, criticism, and literary translations, of *topical* readings introduced into the educational system, of the altered social status and the public role of intellectuals. The aesthetic and ideological changes reflected from the change of the permanent circle of collaborators of the periodicals on culture and the changed names (*Literary Front* was renamed as *Literary Forum*, *September* was renamed as *Chronicle*, and *Popular Culture* was renamed as *Culture*), to the alternative creative formations and the publication of a wide variety of new papers and journals.

In the mid-1990s, the anti-communist writers left the official *Writers' Union* and formed the *Bulgarian Writers' Union*. The *Literaturen vestnik* played an important part in the history of democratic periodical press. The publication unified young poets, writers, and critics, tolerating their avant-garde postmodern attitude. *Plamak*, *Panorama*, *Savremennik*, *Fakel*, and *More* were all journals of varied success, depending on their financial security, which continued their existence without changing their titles. In the thematic-anthology issues they posed problems related to literary translations, the critical interpretation of modern theoretical approaches, and presented marginal or forbidden areas of literary history.

The extreme volume of literary production, the thematic challenges and the abundant opportunities for immediate contact with the readers changed the functions of operative criticism, and the mission of literary studies – a.k.a. *new readings*. During this period, literary criticism ceased to value and analytically evaluated both individual works and entire literary domains that were unfamiliar at the time. The literary-critical deconstruction of processes and phenomena, which were in fact very dynamic and mutually exclusive, replaced the so-called periodic *critical reviews* with market charts and media popularity. The current criticism became more of a mediator between the writer and the general public and sometimes skilfully used popular clichés to wilfully act as an advertiser. This, of course, was a natural reaction to the strict ideological control that had recently prevailed in literature, which had turned literary critics into judges, depriving them of the rights of professional and objective interpreters of artistic phenomena. The comprehensive research work of Rosalia Likova, Nikola Georgiev, Svetlozar Igov, Mikhail Nedelchev, Vihren Chernokozhev, Valeri Stefanov, Aleksandar Kyosev, Milena Kirova, Miglena Nikolchina, among others, was significant for the value consideration of the literary process in this period, as well as the later literary criticism and theoretical research of the generation, that actively developed the 1990s literature: Plamen Doynov, Boyko Penchev, Plamen Antov, Boris Minkov, Edvin Sugarev, Ani Ilkov, etc.

Remorse was a crucial element of literary studies because of the manipulatively deformed facts, the forbidden works and the forgotten authors from the history of Bulgarian spirituality in the 20th century. Literary critics assumed the task to outline the credible and objective image of Bulgarian literature. The journals *Literaturna misal*, *Ezik i literatura*, *Balgarski Ezik i literatura*, *Letopisi*, *Literatura* etc. were of great importance in this respect.

The memory of the emblematic issues that formed the classical dimensions of the national literature materialized in the revival of the journal titles – *Strelets*, *Hyperion*, *Nov Zlatorog* – but despite their aesthetic eclecticism, they didn't last long. Only the journal *Vezni* enjoyed long years of publishing thanks to its pragmatic adaptability to the market norms of modern times. The *Ah*, *Maria* and *Seasons* journals offered an alternative in terms of the artistic platform and ambition for elitism, but unfortunately only existed for a short while. Serious articles, which analysed the literary history and the then current cultural process, were published in the *Vek 21* newspaper and the *Demokraticheski Pregled*

journal. The vigorous growth of literary periodicals, their style diversity, stated in avant-garde manifests, in texts with conservative literary-historical programs, was undoubtedly a sign of taking full advantage of the opportunities of democracy, of free, dialectical but polemical imposition, development and disappearance of artistic processes at the end of the 20th century. It was precisely these that marked the restoration of the rights denied to literature and literary science in terms of making an ideologeme-free choice. The challenges of new technology implied the creation of previously unknown forms of intellectual communication. Electronic publications and websites (such as Georgi Chobanov's *LiterNet* and Martin Mitov's *The Word*, etc.) moved literature to a socio-cultural field, which was to become more and more influential in the next decades.

Political changes provoked a massive wave not only to illuminate taboo areas of literary history, but also to a moral reevaluation of conscious or forced existential and creative compromises. This trend mostly found an artistic realization (more honest or more manipulated) in the blossoming forth of the memoir and documentary literature. Through the prism of the subjective memory or the daily chronicle of time recorded in diaries, the Bulgarian writers built the complex mosaic of the totalitarian period. Subjectively experienced, but also full of documentary facts, the memorial artistic space brought some credible knowledge, but also vivid information about the political and cultural life of the recent past. The posthumously published *Dnevniitsi ot razlichni godini* by Emilian Stanev and *Dnevnik* by one of the leading literary critics in the years of social realism – Boris Delchev – were accepted with great interest, but also with extensive discussions. The fictionally written memories of Vera Mutafchieva *Bivalitsi (True Stories)*, Georgi Danailov *Dokolkoto si spomnyam (As Far As I Can Remember)*, Konstantin Iliev *Porazhenieto (The Defeat)* also attracted interest. Peter Alipiev created an original chronology of that period through ironic recognition in anecdotes in *Bez malko Tirtei (Almost Tyrtaeus)*. By examining archives and documents, Emil Dimitrov, Bozhidar Kunchev, Mikhail Nedelchev, Tsveta Trifonova, Vihren Chernokozhev did valuable research into strictly protected political zones of cultural life or ideological mythologized personalities from the years of totalitarianism. The books investigating the murder of the writer Georgi Markov played a significant part in outlining the tragic marks left by the Communist regime on literary life. One of the first books of that kind was Hristo Stoyanov's *Ubiyte Skitnik (Kill the Wanderer)*.

Emigrant fate – a curse or a chance. This is one of the sustainable subjects in the 1990s cultural space. The return of Bulgarian emigrating intellectuals was more than an important milestone in their lives. Literature attempted to illuminate and understand the political secrets of totalitarian times, narrated by the books of writers, journalists, emigrants from different generations. With their sophisticated style and slightly archaic vocabulary, the books by Stefan Popov, Stefan Gruev, Peter Uvaliev, Hristo Ognianov, restored both the sense of sacredness of the national, in spite of the vicissitudes of life, and the original meaning of patriotism – not as a hollow and loud slogan, but as a conscious mission

of the intellectual. In the plots of their publicist, essayistic, memorial works, most often memories and political analyses, historical realities, and vivid psychological observations intertwined.

In the fictional domain of artistic texts and in the autobiographical stories of Marran Gosov, Dimitar Bochev, Atanas Slavov, Lyubomir Kanov, Iliya Troyanov and many others, the memories of the traumatic scars left by the events in our country but also in the foreign social and cultural environment were supplemented by current political comments, philosophical interpretations of impossible existential choices and national chances. The complex synthesis between the memoir, the documentary, and the artistic made of emigrants' books an authentic proof of the Bulgarian 20th century. They provided a possible reading of political events that had changed the messages and the mission of literature. Undoubtedly, the most important act of remorse was Georgi Markov's official return to Bulgarian literature – his crime stories, novelettes, and dramas, especially *Zadochni reportazhi (In Absentia Reports)*. The latter, in particular, showed most vividly and to the bitter end the model of the totalitarian system, which manipulated and killed. They embedded the will for truth and memory, for the expected change and the much-needed spiritual catharsis in the 1990s.

Besides the active translation of literary texts filling the *gaps* of knowledge about the current trends in the development of humanitarian science, an important, not so much autobiographical, but socially significant element was the placement of the works of Julia Krasteva and Tzvetan Todorov – scientists of world recognition – in the Bulgarian cultural context. The end of the century marked the beginning of their return and their increasing presence in the national spiritual space in the following decades.

The works of bright creative individuals (Blaga Dimitrova, Konstantin Pavlov, Radoy Ralin, Boris Hristov, Ivaylo Petrov, Ivan Teofilov, etc.), written before and after the *change*, outlined the signs of the difficult path of Bulgarian literature from the closed, ideologically burdened context of socialist realism to the aesthetic challenges and artistic experiments of modern times. This boundary time-space, which separated freedom from non-freedom in literature, had many different connotations. One of them was the *truth* about the past. In the novels of Viktor Paskov, Zlatomir Zlatanov, Vladislav Todorov, this truth was filled rather with symbols and images suggesting the tragedy and the permanent traumas of the memory of totalitarian time, than with documentary credibility.

A characteristic feature of the period was the *division* of literature. Once controlled, edited, and censored, it suddenly faced the challenges of the free market and the lack of sustainable artistic criteria. This considerably obliterated the boundaries and equalized high and low, mass and elite, trivial and valuable in the culture of *transition*. Changing the aesthetic paradigm turned the cynical manner of expression, the brutal stories about the crimes of the new *heroes* of the time, their ties to the state structures, into a market bestseller. The public interest, reflected in the large circulation and the media popularity of the *yellow* stories, narrated with dubious artistic qualities, could also be seen as a gesture of rebellion against the ideologues of socialist realism. Unfortunately, the events from

the next decade showed that mass culture imposed a very poor taste, constantly changing aesthetic and moral values. These apparent contrasts were most clearly marked, following the pendulum between the intellectual, ironic and aesthetic plots in prose (Chavdar Tsenov, Lyubomir Milchev, Boris Minkov) and the boulevard one, as well as in the works of Hristo Kalchev, some of the novels of Alexander Tomov, Vlado Daverov, etc.

The transformations in poetics, the new thematic fields, broke the matrix of classical literary styles. In prose, the tradition was parodied by spectacular word play (Lyudmil Stanev), the contemporary social reality was interpreted through the prism of the comedy (Alek Popov, Stefan Kisiov) or the tragedy (Deyan Enev, Palmi Ranchev). An important phenomenon of this period was also Ani Ilkov's poetry, demythologizing sacral concepts and images. The new poets were recognized as followers of Konstantin Pavlov, Nikolay Kanchev, Binyo Ivanov. They emphasized both the prestige of these authors as individuals, who stood their ground, and the influence of their works on the establishment of modern poetic paradigms.

It was difficult to form a steady trend in literary life since 1989. It was dynamically changing and fragmentary. It comprised several creative generations, who were united in intellectual communities and were opposing each other in alternative periodicals. Yet, we could say that postmodernism in Bulgarian posttotalitarian literature was the dominating trend. In the beginning, it was manifested as a sort of rebellion against ideological constraints and aesthetic clichés in art. New circles of writers and experts in literature were formed, united by common aesthetic ideas and political beliefs, which, through manifestoes, parody anthologies, original poetry and prose, modern literary interpretations and long forgotten or forbidden literary and historical texts, not only restored the authentic face of Bulgarian literature, but also outlined the leading trends in the 1990s.

Syncretism was the one feature of Bulgarian postmodern prose. It learned and recreated many models – national and foreign – creating a complex mosaic of quotes, used with elegance and aesthetic refinement. The novels by Georgi Gospodinov, Milen Ruskov, Zlatomir Zlatanov turned historical plots or actual social problems into a scene where the author and the characters played fictional and real narrative etudes. They created an open, provocative plot space, sending messages and motivating the reader to reflection and self-knowledge. Bulgarian postmodern literature revived the power of words to create with the intellectual pleasure of liberated imagination and language unconstrained in its associative provocations.

Throughout the 20th century, women who were creating literature in Bulgaria played a key role in cultural life. They took active public positions and expressed their creative talent in all genres. But in various literary and historical stages their creativity was subordinated to various causes and ideologies – from the achievement of political equality, through social and everyday emancipation to creative equality. In the 1990s, the so-called *women's writing* was in line with the current problems of feminism. Female authors had a subtler, but more painful sensitivity to the moral and ethical transformations of that time, to the unregulated chaos causing the collapse of values, but also to the creative temptations

offered by the new thematic fields and the ban-free artistic experiments. Female authors tried to subdue the time to words and use it to create a new order, be it a fictional one. The novels and stories of Emilia Dvorianova, Maria Stankova, Teodora Dimova, Albena Stambolova, Zdravka Evtimova were different, both in poetic and in stylistic terms. In general, female authors harmoniously combined philosophical, biblical, and existential themes and used them to analyse the models of women's identity, the psychological dimensions of love, solitude and alienation, intimate and social spaces of women. Mirela Ivanova, Silvia Choleva, Virginia Zaharieva, Amelia Licheva, Miglena Nikolchina, etc., also established a distinguished poetical style. They created the poetic image of a modern woman seeking her identity and asserting her right to existential choice and sexual liberty.

The presentation of emblematic events and authors marked the symptomatic processes in the modern Bulgarian culture of the *transition*, situated in problematic and controversial artistic contexts. In this complex, dynamically changing environment, their chronological order and factual exhaustiveness were not so crucial, it was rather the aesthetic provocation and the strong social resonance of literary processes, unfamiliar at the time. They included the rebel of the new time, imposing a free creative expression, denying the ideologemes of socialism and the pedestal attitude towards the literary canon. The generation of the 1990s was not afraid to destroy traditional myths and create new mythologemes, to impose alternative genres and to strive for scandalous creative appearances. The closed, chamber self-sufficiency of literature was denied in the name of publicity, the show and the multimedia effects. The fruitful symbiosis between literature, theatre, music, and visual arts was what created the polyphony of languages and styles as a collision between clichés and avant-garde.

The original synthesis of the means of expression and spectacular visual realizations of speech was characteristic of the poetic *Petak 13 (Friday 13)* performances, very popular at the time. In these performances, Mirela Ivanova and Boyko Lambovski skilfully played their verses in front of huge audiences and using precise and spectacular theatrical techniques, by overlaying many roles and masks, they actually managed to adroitly distinguish the poet and the actor. *Avtorski literaturni teatar (The Literary Authors' Theatre)* was another interesting cultural phenomenon of the 1990s. The improvisation, the parody, the meaninglessness, but also the revival of sustainable cultural symbols, consistently and courageously performed by G. Gospodinov, P. Doynov, B. Penchev and J. Eftimov, marked the codes of a different poetics. The originality of this syncretism between theatre and literature indicated the persistent provocations of reconsidering the past, of changing the values of the present; it implied the popularity of these performances by giving them the statute of some sort of a corrective to the traditional, too conservative or ideologically deformed concept of literature. In the context of political changes, these were considered an alternative aesthetic position, signs on the complex path in the validation of Bulgarian literature, seeking its new identity.

The determined transformation of the perception of the author was typical of this period of sudden estrangement from triviality. The author was no longer a mysterious and self-sufficient person, he/she was a writer, but also an actor, a publisher of his/her

works, a person of a clear aesthetic and political position. Our national culture was again free to match European models, albeit much later, in other aesthetic and social and cultural contexts. Authors no longer strived for mediation to present their works to the public. They used traditional paper issues as an occasion to perform various forms of stage appearances. For example: the poetic troubadour duels – interesting, attractive, well conceptualized, focused on intellectuality as knowledge, and improvisation as a focal point of talent. Or crossing the limit between meaning and attraction, the dominance of form over content, the preference for external effects typical of the *Rambo 13* philosophy and literary circle. Discussed or defamed because of their artistic inequality, they were very persistent in time – their bright and sometimes extremely radical appearances continued for almost two decades.

In the years of transition, the concept of the artistic value of the book also changed. Its constitution in the literary canon was not so important, it was rather its publicity, the visualization of the meaning and the messages it conveyed. The search for extravagance and scandal were part of the post-modern cultural gestures, but the revaluation and even the remorse of the representation of forbidden or forgotten authors and works were also significant. The premieres of both classical and new books were remarkable – they were remembered and commented on. P. Doynov's *Rezervatat Visyashtite gradini na Bulgaria* (*Hanging Gardens of Bulgaria*) was a theatrical performance in which the poet played three different parts; the premiere of Y. Eftimov's *Africa. Numbers* was a football match; Roman Kisiov presented his books in a designated artistic space, accompanied by music; other poets included hip-hop dancing or ballet. The poetic play was performed in theatre as Petar Chuhov's *Bezopasni Igli* (*Safety Pins*) (a Sfumato performance), considered by critics as a "haiku holiday in theatre"; *Ela, legni varhu men* (*Come, Lie on Me*) by Sylvia Choleva (University Theatre at New Bulgarian University); *Tapetite na Vremeto* (*The Wallpapers of Time*) by Konstantin Pavlov – poems, staged by Yulia Ognyanova (A. Konstantinov State Satirical Theatre); the artistic project *I, Hamlet*, which took place near the *Salzata* (*The Tear*) Lake in Rila.

The late, and yet intense, attempt to realize the *Slam* phenomenon was also interesting. It was accepted with some suspicion because of the enticing uncertainty of free stage and poetic performance. The poetic scenario caught up with its backwardness by finding new and different forms of communication with the reader-viewer, using publicly available forms of psychotherapy, mass sharing and public empathy, through speech, music, and ritual movements. This is how the poetic performance avoided the boredom of the monotonous reading (Vasil Vidinski, Maria Kalinova, Kamelia Spasova, etc.), provoked, scandalized, caused and discouraged aesthetics (Urban Readings, Literature in Action, Point vs. Point, Virginia Zaharieva, etc.).

It was in this symbiosis between the two arts, in the complex combination of poetry, music, and movement, that the identity of the contemporary artist was more vividly outlined – with no masks or mediators in the communication with the audience. These events definitely distinguished themselves from the rituality of academic readings, parodying the

template critical assessments. They focused on performance and improvisation, created a celebration of the free, unbiased, creative spirit, formed productive connections between vision and words, between literature and show. This was a different literary reality – attractive, sometimes even scandalous, but easily forgotten or replaced by newer modern forms, an essential part of the cultural environment at the end of the 20th century.

This text is left without conclusion because the Bulgarian literature since 1989 is not a finished literary story. It is created even now and is still dynamically changing. Therefore, it is hard to objectively analyse and even harder to present.

References¹

- Alipieva, Antoaneta: *Bulgarian Lyrics from the 1970s: Trends, Models, Names*. Veliko Tărnovo: 2010.
- Antov, Plamen: *Reverse Poetics of the 80's: Down, In, Back*. – In: *Lord of the Wonder. Collection in memory of Georgi Rupchev*. Sofia, 2008, p. 161–172.
- Dimitrov, Emil: *Memory, Anniversary, Canon. Introduction to the Sociology of Bulgarian Literature*. Sofia: 2001.
- Doynov, Plamen: *An alternative canon. The Poets*. Sofia: 2012.
- Eftimov, Yordan: *Poetics of the Agreement and the Disagreement. The Bulgarian Literature from the 1950s to the 1990s and Ideology*. Sofia: 2013.
- Hristova, Natalia: *Specificities of the Bulgarian Dissidence. Power and Intelligence 1956–1989*. Plovdiv: 2005.
- Igov, Svetlozar: *A Short History of the Bulgarian Literature*. Sofia: 2005.
- Ivan Tsanev in *Bulgarian Literature and Culture. Proceedings*. Sofia: 2012.
- Konstantin Pavlov in *Bulgarian Literature and Culture. Proceedings*. Sofia: 2009.
- Kyosev, Aleksandăr: *A Non-Radical Manifesto. A Critique of the Guild Ideology*. – *Fakel* (2005) No 1, p. 265–293.
- Levchev, Vladimir: *Poets without Books and Books without Poets*. – *Plamāk* (1987) No 10, p. 131–139.
- Markov, Georgi: *Extraordinary Reports for Bulgaria*. Sofia: 1990.
- Nedelchev, Mihail: *Both Cultures and Their Poets*. Sofia: 2012.
- Nedelchev, Mihail: *Effect of Spacing*. Sofia: 2015.
- Nikolchina, Miglena: *What is Happening in the New Bulgarian Poetry*. – *Literaturen vestnik* No 24, 20–26 June 1994.
- Novkov, Mitko: *The Youth Will Save the World*. – *Literaturen vestnik* No 16, 14–20 May 1997.
- People's Republic of Bulgaria – The Literature: History, Concepts, Approaches*. Ed. Plamen Doynov. Sofia: 2012.
- Penchev, Boyko: *The Generation – an instrument or a community*. – *Literaturen vestnik* No 5, 7–13 February 2001.
- Popov, Stefan: *The Bulgarian Idea*. Sofia: 1994.
- Radev, Ivan: *With the Scar of the Time*. Sofia: 1980.
- Slavov, Atanas: *Bulgarian Literature of the Thawing*. Sofia: 1994.

1 All the titles are translated from Bulgarian.

Spasov, Rumen: *Continuity or Utopias*. – *Literaturen vestnik* No 5, 7–13 February 2001.

The Years of the Literature – 1989. Proceedings. Ed. Plamen Doynov. Sofia, 2010

Traykova, Elka: *Bulgarian Literary Polemics*. Sofia, 2001.

Trendafilov, Vladimir: *Disintegration of the Podium: Poetry in the 1990s*. – *Plamāk*, No 1–2 (2002).

Trendafilov, Vladimir: *A Week at the Literary Aquarium*. Sofia, 1999.

Znepolski, Ivaylo: *Bulgarian Communism. Socio-Cultural traits and Power Trajectory*. Sofia, 2008.

ირმა რატიანი
(საქართველო)

ელკა ტრაიკოვა
(ბულგარეთი)

**პოლიტიკური პროცესების და ლიტერატურული
დისკურსის ურთიერთმიმართებისათვის.
სოციალისტური ქვეყნების გამოცდილება**

რეზიუმე

საკვანძო სიტყვები: პოლიტიკა, სალიტერატურო პროცესი, საქართველო, ბულგარეთი.

საერთო სათაურით წარმოდგენილია ირმა რატიანისა და ელკა ტრაიკოვას ორნაწილიანი გამოკვლევა, რომელში განხილულია ქართული და ბულგარული ლიტერატურული დისკურსების ურთიერთმიმართება პოლიტიკურ პროცესებთან. ავტორები გამოხატავენ პოლიტიკური მოვლენებით ერთნაირად დატვირთულ, თუმცა განსხვავებულ ეპოქებს.

ირმა რატიანის წერილში საანალიზოდ შერჩეულია 1918-21 წლების საქართველოს დამოუკიდებელი რესპუბლიკა, იმ მოვლენებთან ერთად, რომელიც წინ უძღოდა და მოსდევდა სამწლიანი სახელმწიფოებრიობის არსებობას და განაპირობებდა ქვეყანაში მიმდინარე ზოგადად კულტურულ, კერძოდ, ლიტერატურულ პროცესებს.

თუ საუკუნეების მანძილზე, ეროვნულ-განმათავისუფლებელი მოძრაობის უმთავრესი მარკერი სარწმუნოებრივი იდენტობა იყო, მე-19 საუკუნის დასაწყისიდან მოყოლებული, ერთმორწმუნე რუსეთის მიერ საქართველოს ანექსიის შემდეგ, ქართულმა საზოგადოებამ, რომლის უმთავრეს ბირთვს მწერლობა წარმოადგენდა, გამოიარა პოლიტიკური ბრძოლისა და ეჭვების, იმედისა და გულგატეხილობის გრძელი გზა, სანამ არ მივიდა დასკვნამდე, რომ, საერთო რელიგია საკმარისი არ არის განსხვავებული ტრადიციებისა და ისტორიის მქონე ორი სახელმწიფოს თანაარსებობისათვის.

მე-19 საუკუნის მეორე ნახევრიდან ქართული ანტიკოლონიალისტური მოძრაობის ისტორიულად ჩამოყალიბებული რელიგიური სტრატეგია ნაციონალური სტრატეგიით შეიცვალა. დამკვიდრდა ქართული პოლიტიკური და კულტურული აზროვნებისა და ეროვნული იდენტობის ახალი სტანდარტი. ამასთან, ეროვნული ღირებულებების ცნება არასოდეს ყოფილა რადიკალური პატრიოტიზმისა და იაფფასიანი სპეკულაციების საგანი ქართველი მოაზროვნეებისათვის, უპირველეს ყოვლისა, ეს იყო საუკეთესო ჰუმანისტური იდეების გაერთიანების საშუალება.

ახალი საუკუნის პირველი ათწლეული ქართულ ლიტერატურაში მოდერნიზმის გაფუძვნიება და ავანგარდული კულტურის დაფუძნებით გამოირჩა, როგორც ლოგიკური გაგრძელება მსოფლიო კულტურასთან მჭიდროდ დაკავშირებული ეროვნული ლიტერატურული ნარატივისა. მაღალმა მოდერნიზმმა, თავისი მრავალფეროვანი ფორმებითა და შენაკდებით, თავისუფლებისაკენ სწრაფვით, ჭეშმარიტების ძიების მხატვრული ტენდენციებითა და ინდივიდუალიზმის დაფუძნებით, პიკს სწორედ ამ პერიოდში მიაღწია.

1918 წელს ქვეყნის სახელმწიფოებრიობის აღდგენას ქართული ლიტერატურა დიდი იმედებით შეხვდა. ქართველ სიმბოლისტებს მიაჩნდათ, რომ ლიტერატურაში დაწყებულ რენესანსს აუცილებლად მოჰყვებოდა ქვეყნის პოლიტიკური რენესანსიც. აღსანიშნავია, რომ დამოუკიდებლობის პერიოდის ლიტერატურულ ტექსტებში ერთი მხრივ, იგრძნობა ამ უმნიშვნელოვანესი ისტორიული მოვლენით გამოწვეული საზეიმო განწყობა, მეორე მხრივ კი – შიში და ნუხილი, რომელიც განპირობებული იყო გარემომცველი რეალობის გონივრული ინტერპრეტირებით.

1921 წლის შემდეგ ქართული ლიტერატურა განსხვავებული რეალობის წინაშე დადგა. მწერალთა დიდი ნაწილი „საბჭოთა სახელმწიფოს მტრებად“ გამოცხადდა. სწორედ ამ მიზეზით დაისაჯა პროგრესული, მოდერნისტული და ავანგარდული ფრთის არაერთი წარმომადგენელი. სიტუაციის ტრაგიკულობას ქმნიდა არა მხოლოდ ცალკეულ მწერალთა ბედისწერის, არამედ ლიტერატურული პროცესის მთლიანი პარადიგმის ნგრევა, რომელსაც 70-წლიანი საბჭოთა დიქტატურის დასრულების შემდეგ ხანგრძლივი კულტურული რეაბილიტაცია დასჭირდა და ჯერაც მიმდინარეობს.

ბულგარელი მკვლევარი ანალიზებს იმ პროცესებს, რომელიც განვითარდა ბულგარულ ლიტერატურაში სოციალისტური ბანაკის დასუსტებისა და მისი საბოლოოდ დაშლის შემდგომ პერიოდში.

ბულგარეთის ისტორიაში 1989 წელი ითვლება მიჯნად, საიდანაც იწყება ქვეყნის როგორც პოლიტიკური, ისე კულტურული ცხოვრების ახალი ეტაპი.

იდეოლოგიურ კლიშეებზე უარის თქმამ, ესთეტიკური შეზღუდვების მოხსნამ ხელი შეუწყო ახლი პოეტიკის და პოეტური ენის, პროზისა და დრამის დაბადებას, ლიტერატურის ისტორიის უპრეცედენტო ნაკითხვას, ახალი ავ-

ტორების, ტექსტებისა და მოვლენების გაჩენას. ბულგარულ ლიტერატურაში ჩამოყალიბდა ახალი ესთეტიკური ტენდენციები, რომელსაც დასაშვებად მიაჩნდა მხატვრული ექსპერიმენტები და თემატური პროვოკაციები.

21-ე საუკუნის დასაწყისის ბულგარული ლიტერატურა წარმოადგენს სტილთა და სიუჟეტთა რთულ კონგლომერატს, რომლის მხატვრული ღირებულება არაერთგვაროვანია. აქტიურად მიმდინარეობს ლიტერატურის ისტორიის გადახედვა, კავშირის აღდგენა აკრძალულ და დავიწყებულ ავტორებთან.

ლიტერატურა გათავისუფლდა ჩაკეტილობისა და ელიტური თვითკმარობისგან, დაიწყო საზოგადოებრივი თვითრეალიზების ალტერნატიულ ფორმების ძიება. ესთეტიკური და იდეოლოგიური ცვლილებები აისახა პერიოდული გამოცემების თანამშრომელთა მუდმივი წრისა და გამოცემების სახელწოდებების ცვლილებითაც.

შეიცვალა ლიტერატურული კრიტიკის ფუნქცია, ლიტერატური კვლევების მისია კი ძველი ტექსტების ხელახალი წაკითხვა გახდა. კრიტიკამ შეწყვიტა კონკრეტული ნაწარმოებებისა და პროცესების შეფასება და ის ჩაანაცვლა მასმედიაში გამოქვეყნებული მიმოხილვებით, საბაზრო ღირებულებისა და პოპულარობის განმსაზღვრელი დიაგრამებით. ეს ბუნებრივი რეაქცია იყო იმ იდეოლოგიურ კლიშეებზე, რომლებიც სულ ცოტა ხნით ადრე ბატონობდა ლიტერატურაში და კრიტიკოსებს მოსამართლეებად აქცევდა, ართმევდა მათ მხატვრული მოვლენის პროფესიულად და ობიექტურად შეფასების უფლებას.

პოლიტიკურმა ცვლილებებმა გამოიწვია არა მარტო ისტორიულად აკრძალული თემების გაშუქების მასობრივი ტალღა, არამედ მორალური გადაფასებაც. ამ ტენდენციამ განსაკუთრებული ასახვა ჰპოვა მემორიალური და დოკუმენტური ლიტერატურის აყვავების სახით. სუბიექტური მახსოვრობით აღდგენილი თუ დღიურებში ჩანერილი ყოველდღიური ქრონიკის მეშვეობით, ბულგარელმა მწერლებმა აანყვეს ტოტალიტარული ეპოქის რთული მოზაიკა.

მნიშვნელოვანი მოვლენა გახდა ბულგარულ ემიგრანტ ინტელექტუალთა დაბრუნება სამშობლოში. ლიტერატურა ცდილობდა გაეშუქებინა და გაეგო ტოტალური დროის პოლიტიკური საიდუმლოებები, რომლებიც სხვადასხვა თაობის ემიგრანტთა წიგნებში იყო გადმოცემული.

აქტიურად ითარგმნებოდა ტექსტები, რომლებიც ავსებდა ჰუმანიტარული მეცნიერების განვითარების თანამედროვე ტენდენციების ცოდნას.

საუკუნის დასასრული აღინიშნა იულია კრისტევასა და ცვეტან ტოდოროვის – მსოფლიო მნიშვნელობის მეცნიერთა დაბრუნებითა და სულ უფრო მზარდი მონაწილეობით მომდევნო ათწლეულის ეროვნული სულიერების სივრცეში.

ბულგარული პოსტმოდერნიზმი ხასიათდებოდა სინკრეტიზმით. მან შეისწავლა და აღადგინა მრავალი უცხოური და ეროვნული მოდელი. ამ ტექსტებში ისტორიული სიუჟეტები თუ აქტუალური სოციალური პრობლემები იქცა სცენად, რომელზეც ავტორი და პერსონაჟები ათამაშებდნენ ნამდვილ და გამოგონილ ნარატიულ ეტიუდებს.

მყარი მხატვრული კრიტერიუმების არარსებობისა და თავისუფალი საბაზრო ეკონომიკის პირობებში, წაიშალა საზღვრები მასობრივ და ელიტურ, ტრივიალურ და ღირებულ ლიტერატურას შორის. ესთეტიკური პარადიგმების ცვლილებამ გამოხატვის ცინიკური მანერა, დანაშაულების სასტიკი ისტორიები ბაზრის ბესტსელერებად აქცია.

1989 წლიდან რთული გახდა ბულგარეთის ლიტერატურული ცხოვრების მყარი ტენდენციების ჩამოყალიბება. ეს იყო ფრაგმენტული და დინამიურად ცვალებადი, სხვადასხვა ინტელექტუალურ ჯგუფებში გაერთიანებული და ალტერნატიული გამოცემებით ურთიერთდაპირისპირებული რამდენიმე თაობისაგან შემდგარი ლიტერატურული საზოგადოება.

ბულგარულ ლიტერატურაში მიმდინარე პოსტსოციალისტური პროცესი ჯერაც არ დასრულებულა, ის დინამიკური ცვლილებებს განაგრძობს, რაც არის მიზეზი იმისა, რომ ავტორი დასკვნების გარეშე ტოვებს წარმოდგენილ სტატიას.